arXiv:1301.1140v3 [math.RT] 23 Apr 2013

# FACES AND MAXIMIZER SUBSETS OF HIGHEST WEIGHT MODULES

APOORVA KHARE
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT. In this paper we compute, in three ways, the set of weights of all simple highest weight modules (and others) over a complex semisimple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. This extends the notion of the Weyl polytope to a large class of highest weight $\mathfrak{g}$-modules $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Our methods involve computing the convex hull of the weights; this is precisely the Weyl polytope when $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is finite-dimensional.

We also show that for all simple modules, the convex hull of the weights is a $W_J$-invariant polyhedron for some parabolic subgroup $W_J$. We compute its vertices, (weak) faces, and symmetries - more generally, we do this for all parabolic Verma modules, and for all modules $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ with $\lambda$ not on a simple root hyperplane. Our techniques also enable us to completely classify inclusion relations between "weak faces" of the set $\operatorname{wt}(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$ of weights of arbitrary $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$, in the process extending results of Vinberg, Chari-Dolbin-Ridenour, and Cellini-Marietti to all highest weight modules.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction 1
2. Motivations, connections, and literature survey 3
3. The main results 8
4. Classifying (positive) weak faces for simply-regular highest weights 11
5. Finite maximizer subsets and generalized Verma modules 17
6. Application 1: Weights of simple highest weight modules 21
7. Inclusion relations among maximizer subsets 23
8. Extending the Weyl polytope to (pure) highest weight modules 26
9. Application 2: Largest and smallest modules with specified hull or stabilizer 29
Appendix A. Paths between comparable weights in highest weight modules 30
References 32

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This paper contributes to the study of highest weight modules over a complex semisimple Lie algebra. Some of these, such as (generalized/parabolic) Verma modules and finite-dimensional simple modules, are classical and well understood - e.g. for "generic" highest weights which are antidominant. However, more work needs to be done for infinite-dimensional "non-Verma" highest weight modules. Important questions such as the set of weights of these modules, or the multiplicities of these weights are not fully resolved as yet.

In this paper we present three formulas for computing the weights of an arbitrary simple highest weight module, including one in terms of finite-dimensional submodules for a distinguished Levi subalgebra, and another in terms of the convex hull of the weights. More precisely, fix a complex semisimple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, a set of simple roots $\Delta$ in the space $\mathfrak{h}^*$ of weights, the associated Weyl group $W$ and root space decomposition for $\mathfrak{g}$, and an arbitrary weight $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. One of our original motivations in this paper was to compute the set of weights of the highest weight module $L(\lambda)$.

---

*Date*: December 12, 2013.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 17B20; Secondary: 17B10, 52B20.

*Key words and phrases.* Weak $\mathbb{A}$-face, (pure) highest weight module, Weyl polytope, parabolic Verma module.

The author was partially supported by the DARPA Grant YFA N66001-11-1-4131.

A simpler, related question would be to compute the convex hull of the weights of $L(\lambda)$, or of an arbitrary highest weight module $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, where $M(\lambda)$ is the Verma module. If $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = M(\lambda)$, this hull is a polyhedron with unique vertex $\lambda$. On the other hand, if $\lambda$ is dominant integral and $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = L(\lambda)$ is simple, its set of weights $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$ is finite and $W$-invariant. The convex hull $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ of this latter finite set is called the *Weyl polytope* for $\lambda$. (Polytopes and polyhedra are defined in Definition 2.6.) It is well-known that

$$\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} W(\lambda) = \mathcal{P}(\lambda) := \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} L(\lambda), \qquad \operatorname{wt} L(\lambda) = (\lambda - \mathbb{Z}\Delta) \cap \mathcal{P}(\lambda), \tag{1.1}$$

where $W(\lambda)$ is the set of Weyl translates of $\lambda$, as well as the vertex set of $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$. However, the structure of $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$ is not known for an arbitrary simple module $L(\lambda)$. Additionally, it is natural to ask if Equation (1.1) holds for other highest weights $\lambda$. Thus, understanding the structure of simple highest weight modules was one of the main motivating goals in this paper. One of our main results is as follows; all undefined notation is explained later.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Suppose* $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ *and* $\Delta = \{\alpha_i : i \in I\}$. *Define* $J_\lambda := \{i \in I : \frac{2(\lambda,\alpha_i)}{(\alpha_i,\alpha_i)} \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$. *Then,*

$$\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda) = (\lambda - \mathbb{Z}\Delta) \cap \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} L(\lambda) = \coprod_{n_i \geq 0 \ \forall i \in I \setminus J_\lambda} \operatorname{wt} L_{J_\lambda}(\lambda - \sum_{i \in I \setminus J_\lambda} n_i \alpha_i), \tag{1.3}$$

*where* $\mathfrak{h} + \mathfrak{g}_{J_\lambda}$ *is the Levi subalgebra of* $\mathfrak{g}$ *corresponding to* $J_\lambda$, *and* $L_{J_\lambda}(\mu)$ *is the (simple) highest weight* $(\mathfrak{h} + \mathfrak{g}_{J_\lambda})$*-submodule of* $L(\mu)$ *generated by the highest weight vector of* $L(\mu)$. *Moreover,* $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$ *is a* $W_{J_\lambda}$*-stable convex polyhedron, with vertex set* $W_{J_\lambda}(\lambda)$.

For a "third formula" and in greater generality, see Theorem 5.

This theorem provides an explicit formula for the set of weights of $L(\lambda)$ (for all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$), which also demonstrates the invariance of $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$ under the parabolic subgroup $W_{J_\lambda}$ of $W$. (This corresponds to the integrability of $L(\lambda)$ under the Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} + \mathfrak{g}_{J_\lambda}$.) An obvious consequence is that the set of weights of an arbitrary highest weight module $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is determined by computing the multiplicities $[\mathbb{V}^\lambda : L(w \bullet \lambda)]$ of its Jordan-Holder factors (which lie in the BGG Category $\mathcal{O}$).

A more direct attempt to compute $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is to prove an analogue of Theorem 1.2 for $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$. However, this result fails to hold for all $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ - see Theorem 6.2 below. Nevertheless, the techniques used in proving Theorem 1.2 for simple modules $L(\lambda)$ yield many other rewards. For instance,

- Computing the weights and their convex hulls, for other families of highest weight modules $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$. These modules $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ are infinite-dimensional, whence their sets of weights $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ are infinite. We are nevertheless able to show that their convex hulls are polyhedra - i.e., *finite* intersections of half-spaces in Euclidean space. This includes all Verma and simple modules.
- Classifying the faces of these convex hulls, and writing down precisely the inclusion relations between these faces.
- Results in the literature (by Vinberg, Cellini, Chari, and others) which were known earlier only for finite-dimensional simple modules, are now shown for all highest weight modules.

Another feature of this paper is to focus on several important families of highest weight modules that feature prominently in the literature:

(i) Parabolic Verma modules, which include all Verma modules as well as finite-dimensional simple modules.
(ii) All simple highest weight modules $L(\lambda)$.
(iii) All modules $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ with $\lambda$ not on a simple root hyperplane. These include all antidominant weights $\lambda$ (whence $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = M(\lambda) = L(\lambda)$) as well as all regular weights $\lambda$.

We also consider a fourth class of highest weight modules termed "pure" modules. These modules feature in the classification of all simple $\mathfrak{h}$-weight $\mathfrak{g}$-modules, in work of Fernando [Fe]. In this paper we provide a wide variety of techniques for studying all of these families of modules. Thus, a module that lies in more than one of these families can be studied in more than one way. For instance, the following result holds for three different kinds of highest weight modules. Corresponding to these, there are three proofs in this paper.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Suppose* $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ *is arbitrary with* $\lambda$ *not on any simple root hyperplane, or* $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ *is a Verma or simple module. Then:*

1. *The convex hull of* $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ *(in Euclidean space) is a* $W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$*-invariant convex polyhedron with vertex set* $W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda)$*, for a certain subset of simple roots* $J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$*.*
2. *Every face of this polyhedron is a* $W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$*-translate of a unique "dominant" face* $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda = (\lambda - \mathbb{Z}_+\Delta_J) \cap \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ *for some* $\Delta_J \subset \Delta$*.*
3. *There exist unique "largest" and "smallest" highest weight modules* $M_{\max}, M_{\min}$*, such that for any highest weight module* $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}'$*,*

$$\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}' = \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda \quad \iff \quad M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow M_{\max} \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}' \twoheadrightarrow M_{\min}.$$

Various parts of this theorem appear in our main results in Section 3.

**Organization.** We now briefly outline the rest of the paper. In Section 2, we discuss several motivating questions and results in the literature, as well as connections between them and the current paper. We also survey known results from the literature (which are mostly for finite-dimensional modules) by reformulating some of them into the language of *weak faces*; this notation is very convenient to extend these results to all highest weight modules.

Section 3 contains the main results of this paper. In Section 4, we classify the weak faces that contain the highest weight; this approach also provides an alternate proof of some of the results in [KhRi] for all highest weight modules over a dense set of weights. The remainder of the paper is devoted to proving the main results stated in Section 3. This culminates in Section 8, where we compute the convex hull, stabilizer subgroup, and vertices of (the hull of) the weights of all simple highest weight modules (among others). There are also two applications of our techniques and results. In Section 6, we present our main application and motivating question: namely, to compute the set of weights of simple highest weight modules (and others). In Section 9, we compute the unique "largest" and "smallest" highest weight modules with specified convex hull of weights.

## 2. Motivations, connections, and literature survey

In this section, we describe several connections to the literature, as well as specific questions whose answers are known for finite-dimensional simple modules, or for (parabolic) Verma modules. These results and connections have motivated the present paper. We will reformulate some of the results in terms of "weak faces" - this aids in systematically stating, extending, and proving them.

2.1. **Notation and preliminaries.** We write down some basic notation and results on linear combinations and on Verma modules; these will be freely used without reference in what follows. Let $\mathbb{R} \supset \mathbb{F} \supset \mathbb{Q} \supset \mathbb{Z}$ denote the real numbers, a (possibly fixed) subfield, the rationals, and the integers respectively. Given an $\mathbb{R}$-vector space $\mathbb{V}$ and $R \subset \mathbb{R}$, $X, Y \subset \mathbb{V}$, define $X \pm Y$ to be their Minkowski sum $\{x \pm y : x \in X, y \in Y\}$, $R_+ := R \cap [0, \infty)$, and $RX$ to be the set of all finite linear combinations $\sum_{i=1}^k r_i x_i$, where $r_i \in R$ and $x_i \in X$. (This includes the empty sum 0 if $k = 0$.) Let $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}}(X)$ denote the set of convex $\mathbb{R}_+$-linear combinations of $X$.

Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a complex semisimple Lie algebra with a fixed triangular decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{n}^+ \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^-$. Let the corresponding root system be $\Phi$, with simple roots $\Delta := \{\alpha_i : i \in I\}$ and corresponding fundamental weights $\Omega := \{\omega_i : i \in I\}$ both indexed by $I$. For any $J \subset I$, define $\Delta_J := \{\alpha_j : j \in J\}$, and $\Omega_J$ similarly. Set $\rho_J := \sum_{j \in J} \omega_j$, and define $W_J$ to be the subgroup of the Weyl group $W$ (of $\mathfrak{g}$), generated by the simple reflections $\{s_j = s_{\alpha_j} : j \in J\}$. Let $\mathfrak{h}^*_{\mathbb{R}}$ be the real form of $\mathfrak{h}^*$ - i.e., the $\mathbb{R}$-span of $\Delta$. Then $\mathfrak{h}^*_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R}\Omega$ as well. The *height* of a weight $\mu = \sum_{i \in I} r_i \alpha_i \in \mathfrak{h}^*_{\mathbb{R}}$ is defined as $\operatorname{ht}\mu := \sum_i r_i$. Moreover, $\mathfrak{h}^*$ has a standard partial order via: $\lambda \geq \mu$ if $\lambda - \mu \in \mathbb{Z}_+\Delta$. Now let $P := \mathbb{Z}\Omega \supset Q := \mathbb{Z}\Delta$ be the weight and root lattices in $\mathfrak{h}^*_{\mathbb{R}}$ respectively, and define

$$P_J^+ := \mathbb{Z}_+\Omega_J, \quad Q_J^+ := \mathbb{Z}_+\Delta_J, \quad P^+ := P_I^+, \quad Q^+ := Q_I^+, \quad \Phi_J^\pm := \Phi \cap \pm Q_J^+, \quad \Phi^\pm := \Phi_I^\pm. \tag{2.1}$$

Thus, $P^+ = P_I^+$ is the set of dominant integral weights. Let $(,)$ be the positive definite symmetric bilinear form on $\mathfrak{h}^*_{\mathbb{R}}$ induced by the restriction of the Killing form on $\mathfrak{g}$ to $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{R}}$. Then $(\omega_i, \alpha_j) = \delta_{i,j}(\alpha_j,\alpha_j)/2\ \forall i,j \in I$. Define $h_i$ to be the unique element of $\mathfrak{h}$ identified with $(2/(\alpha_i,\alpha_i))\alpha_i$ via the Killing form. The $h_i$ form a basis of $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{R}}$. Now fix a set of Chevalley generators $\{x_{\alpha_i}^\pm \in \mathfrak{n}^\pm : i \in I\}$ such that $[x_{\alpha_i}^+, x_{\alpha_j}^-] = \delta_{ij} h_i$ for all $i, j \in I$. Also extend $(,)$ to all of $\mathfrak{h}^*$. Then,

$$\alpha_i(h_i) = 2, \quad \omega_j(h_i) = \delta_{i,j}, \quad \lambda(h_i) = \frac{2(\lambda,\alpha_i)}{(\alpha_i,\alpha_i)}, \qquad \forall i,j \in I,\ \lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*. \tag{2.2}$$

Define $M(\lambda)$ to be the Verma module with highest weight $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. In other words, set $M(\lambda) := U\mathfrak{g}/U\mathfrak{g}(\mathfrak{n}^+ + \ker\lambda)$. This is an $\mathfrak{h}$-semisimple, cyclic $\mathfrak{g}$-module which has a unique simple quotient $L(\lambda)$. Moreover, $M(\lambda)$ is "universal" among the set of $\mathfrak{g}$-modules generated by a vector of weight $\lambda$ that is killed by $\mathfrak{n}^+$. Every module in this latter set is called a *highest weight module* and we will denote a typical such module by $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Thus, $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda \twoheadrightarrow L(\lambda)$. Additionally, $M(\lambda)$ has a finite Jordan-Holder series. The composition factors are necessarily of the form $L(w \bullet \lambda)$ with $\lambda - w\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_+\Delta$, where $\bullet$ denotes the twisted action of the Weyl group on $\mathfrak{h}^*$: $w \bullet \lambda := w(\lambda + \rho_I) - \rho_I$.

Finally, the $\lambda$-weight space of an $\mathfrak{h}$-module $M$ is $M_\lambda := \{m \in M : hm = \lambda(h)m\ \forall h \in \mathfrak{h}\}$. We say that $M$ is a ($\mathfrak{h}$-)weight module if $M = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*} M_\lambda$. If moreover $\dim M_\lambda < \infty\ \forall \lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, the formal character of $M$ is defined to be $\operatorname{ch} M := \sum_{\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*} (\dim M_\lambda) e^\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{\mathfrak{h}^*}$. Submodules and quotient modules of weight modules are weight modules. It is clear that $M(\lambda)$ is a weight module with finite-dimensional weight spaces. Moreover, $M(\lambda)$ is a free $U(\mathfrak{n}^-)$-module of rank one by the PBW theorem, whose weights are precisely $\lambda - Q^+ = \lambda - \mathbb{Z}_+\Delta$ and whose formal character is given by the (translated) Kostant partition function. For a comprehensive treatment of Verma modules and their simple quotients (as well as a distinguished category $\mathcal{O}$ in which they all lie), the reader is referred to the recent and comprehensive book by Humphreys [Hu].

2.2. **Motivation 1: weights and their hulls of simple and Verma modules.** One of our main motivations for this paper comes from a knowledge of two special families of simple modules $L(\lambda)$. The first is the set of *antidominant* highest weights $\lambda$ - i.e., $2(\lambda + \rho_I, \alpha)/(\alpha,\alpha) - 1 \notin \mathbb{Z}_+$ for all $\alpha \in \Phi^+$. In this case, $M(\lambda)$ is simple (see [Hu, Theorem 4.8]), and hence is the unique highest weight module with highest weight $\lambda$. Thus, $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda) = \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda) = \lambda - \mathbb{Z}_+\Delta$, and one checks that this equals $(\lambda - \mathbb{Z}\Delta) \cap \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$.

The interesting phenomena occur at the "opposite end" (this is made precise presently), for dominant integral $\lambda$ - i.e., $\lambda \in P^+$. Simple modules for such $\lambda$ yield symmetries, combinatorial formulas, as well as crystals. It is standard (see [Hu, Chapter 2]) that $\dim L(\lambda) < \infty$ if and only if $\lambda \in P^+$, in which case,

$$L(\lambda) = M(\lambda) \ / \ \sum_{i \in I} U\mathfrak{g}(x_{\alpha_i}^-)^{\lambda(h_i)+1} m_\lambda.$$

We now state two results that will be used repeatedly in the paper.

**Theorem 2.3.** *Notation as above. Fix* $\lambda, \mu \in P^+$.

(1) *(*[Ha, Proposition 7.13 and Theorem 7.41]*.)* $\mathcal{P}(\lambda) := \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$ *equals* $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} W(\lambda)$*, and* $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda) = (\lambda - \mathbb{Z}\Delta) \cap \mathcal{P}(\lambda)$.

(2) *(*[KLV, Proposition 2.2]*.)* $\lambda - \mu \in \mathbb{Z}_+\Delta$ *if and only if* $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} W(\mu) \subset \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} W(\lambda)$.

Given these two families, the following question is natural (and was posed to us by D. Bump):

**Question 2.4.** Is it true that $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda) = (\lambda - \mathbb{Z}\Delta) \cap \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$ for arbitrary $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$?

This question has a positive answer; see Theorem 1.2. Indeed, we go beyond the above question, in that we also describe explicitly the set of weights $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$ as a disjoint union of $W_{J_\lambda}$-stable sets in Theorem 1.2. Our formula therein specializes to the cases of dominant integral $\lambda$ (where $J_\lambda = I$) and to antidominant $\lambda$ (where $J_\lambda$ is empty - thus, these two families are at "opposite ends").

Our formula also specializes to all Verma modules; the only difference is that now one replaces $J_\lambda$ by the empty set for all $\lambda$. Thus, it is natural to ask how to reconcile all of these results.

**Question 2.5.** Is there a class of modules which includes Verma and simple modules, for which the set of weights can be computed as in Theorem 1.2? What should one use in place of $J_\lambda$, for a general module in this class?

It is well-known that Verma and (finite-dimensional) simple modules are both examples of "parabolic" Verma modules (also referred to as "generalized" or "relative" Verma modules) $M(\lambda, J)$ for $J \subset J_\lambda$; see [Hu, §9.4]. We answer the rest of Question 2.5 for all modules $M(\lambda, J)$ (and others) in Theorem 5, with $J_\lambda$ replaced by $J$. For future use we now define and discuss these modules briefly.

**Definition 2.6.** (From Theorem 1.2.) Given $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, define $J_\lambda := \{i \in I : \lambda(h_i) \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$.

1. Let $\mathfrak{g}_J$ denote the semisimple Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ generated by $\{x^\pm_{\alpha_j} : j \in J\}$.
2. Define the parabolic Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{p}_J := \mathfrak{g}_J + \mathfrak{h} + \mathfrak{n}^+$ for all $J \subset I$. Now given $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and $J \subset J_\lambda$, define the *$J$-parabolic Verma module* with highest weight $\lambda$ to be $M(\lambda, J) := U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{p}_J)} L_J(\lambda)$. Here, $L_J(\lambda)$ is a simple finite-dimensional highest weight module over the Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} + \mathfrak{g}_J$; it is also killed by $\mathfrak{g}_{I \setminus J} \cap \mathfrak{n}^+$ (in $M(\lambda, J)$).
3. A *(convex) polyhedron* is a finite intersection of half-spaces in Euclidean space. A *(convex) polytope* is a compact polyhedron.

Parabolic Verma modules thus unite Verma and simple modules as desired: $M(\lambda, \emptyset) = M(\lambda)$ is a Verma module, while if $\lambda \in P^+$, then $J_\lambda = I$ and $M(\lambda, I)$ is the finite-dimensional simple module $L(\lambda)$. The following basic properties of $M(\lambda, J)$ will be used below without reference.

**Theorem 2.7** ([Hu, Chapter 9]). *Suppose $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and $J \subset J_\lambda$.*

*(1) $M(\lambda, J)$ is a $\mathfrak{g}_J$-integrable $\mathfrak{g}$-module generated by a highest weight vector $m_\lambda$, with relations:*

$$\mathfrak{n}^+ m_\lambda = (\ker \lambda) m_\lambda = (x^-_{\alpha_j})^{\lambda(h_j)+1} m_\lambda = 0, \qquad \forall j \in J.$$

*(2) The formal character of $M(\lambda, J)$ (and hence $\operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J)$) is $W_J$-invariant.*

**Remark 2.8.** Given the positive answers to Question 2.5, a natural follow-up question is if Theorem 1.2 holds for every highest weight module $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$. As we show in Theorem 6.2, this is *false*.

In light of these results and remarks, one can ask the weaker question of computing convex hulls of weights for various modules $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$. More importantly, this weaker question is relevant because convex hulls of weights of highest weight modules are crucially used in computing the set of weights themselves - e.g., in Theorem 1.2. Note that the convex hull of parabolic Verma modules is known:

**Proposition 2.9** ([KhRi, Proposition 2.4]). *Given $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and $J \subset J_\lambda$, $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J)$ is a $W_J$-invariant convex polyhedron with vertices $W_J(\lambda)$. It is the Minkowski sum of the polytope $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} W_J(\lambda)$ and the cone $\mathbb{R}_+(\Phi^- \setminus \Phi^-_J)$.*

Thus, a natural question to ask (in light of, as well as to show, various results above) is as follows:

**Question 2.10.** Fix $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Is the convex hull $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ of the (infinite) set of weights a convex polyhedron (i.e., cut out by *finitely* many hyperplanes)? If so, identify the vertices, extremal rays, and faces of this polyhedron, as well as its stabilizer subgroup in $W$.

The answer is immediate (and positive) for all Verma modules, and hence for all antidominant weights $\lambda$. These weights constitute a Zariski dense set in $\mathfrak{h}^*$, namely the complement of countably many (affine) hyperplanes. Thus, all "non-Verma" highest weight modules have highest weights in this countable set of hyperplanes. In this paper, we completely resolve Question 2.10 for the larger, "(sub-)generic" case of highest weights, which avoid only the finite set of simple root hyperplanes. We also show that $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is a convex polyhedron for all simple modules $L(\lambda)$, parabolic Verma modules $M(\lambda, J)$, and all "pure" modules (defined below). See Theorems 2,3 in Section 3.

2.3. **Motivation 2: Extending Vinberg's classification of faces.** Our next motivation comes from the classification of faces of the Weyl polytope $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in P^+$. Weyl polytopes $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ were carefully studied in [Vi], where Vinberg embedded Poisson-commutative subalgebras of $\operatorname{Sym}(\mathfrak{g})$ into $U(\mathfrak{g})$ via the symmetrization map. In his work, Vinberg classified the faces of $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ as follows:

**Theorem 2.11** ([Vi]). *Given $\lambda \in P^+$, the faces of $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ are of the form $F_{w,J}(\lambda) := w(\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} W_J(\lambda))$ with $w \in W$ and $J \subset I$. Moreover, every face is $W$-conjugate to a unique dominant face $F_{1,J}(\lambda)$.*

These results were extended by the author and Ridenour in [KhRi] to all parabolic Verma modules. In [CM], Cellini and Marietti provided another uniform description for all faces of the *root polytope* $\mathcal{P}(\theta)$. (Here, $\theta$ is the highest root in $\Phi^+$ and $L(\theta) = \mathfrak{g}$ is the adjoint representation.) It is thus natural to ask the following:

- Can Vinberg's results be proved for highest weight modules $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$?
- Write down "inclusion relations" between faces - i.e., which faces $F_{w,J}, F_{w',J'}$ are equal.

Partial results for the second part are known - but only for finite-dimensional simple modules (and trivially for Verma modules). It was shown in [KhRi] that $F_{1,J} = F_{1,J'}$ in $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in P^+$, if and only if $W_J(\lambda) = W_{J'}(\lambda)$. Cellini and Marietti also showed in [CM, Proposition 5.9] that if $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = L(\theta) = \mathfrak{g}$, then $J'$ is any subset of $I$ in some "interval". Namely, $\operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathfrak{g} = \operatorname{wt}_J \mathfrak{g}$ if and only if there exist $J_{\min}, J_{\max}$ depending only on $J$, such that $J_{\min} \subset J' \subset J_{\max}$.

In this paper, we unify and extend all of these results to all modules $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$. See Theorems 3 and 4.

2.4. **Motivation 3: Quantum affine algebras, combinatorics, and weak faces.** Apart from answering longstanding questions about the structure of simple (and other) highest weight modules, this paper is motivated by other research programs in the literature, such as the study of faces of root polytopes. Another such program is the study of quantum affine Lie algebras, (multigraded) current algebras, Takiff algebras, and cominuscule parabolics. In studying the former, one encounters an important class of representations called Kirillov-Reshetikhin (KR-)modules [KiRe], which are widely studied because of their connections to mathematical physics and their rich combinatorial structure. It is thus desirable to obtain a deeper understanding of these modules.

One approach is to specialize KR-modules at $q = 1$; this yields $\mathbb{Z}_+$-graded modules over $\mathfrak{g} \ltimes \mathfrak{g}$, which is a Takiff or truncated current algebra. As recently shown in [CG2], such specializations are projective objects in a suitable category of $\mathbb{Z}_+$-graded $\mathfrak{g} \ltimes \mathfrak{g}$-modules, which is constructed using a face of the root polytope $\mathcal{P}(\theta)$. This helps compute the characters of these modules. Every such face also helps construct families of Koszul algebras [CG1]. This approach has been extended by the author in joint work with Chari and Ridenour [CKR] to faces of all Weyl polytopes $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$. The results of [CKR] were further extended in [BCF], where Chari et al. used faces of Weyl polytopes to study multigraded generalizations of KR-modules over multivariable current algebras. Thus, understanding the faces of $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ and the relationships between them aids these programs as well.

There are additional questions that naturally arise from the above program. In identifying KR-modules at $q = 1$ as projective objects in certain categories of $\mathfrak{g} \ltimes \mathfrak{g}$-modules, Chari and Greenstein work in [CG1, CG2] with a subset $S \subset \Phi^+ = \operatorname{wt} \mathfrak{n}^+$ of positive roots, which satisfies a certain combinatorial condition. Namely, given weights $\lambda_i \in S$ and $\mu_j \in \operatorname{wt} \mathfrak{g}$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i = \sum_{j=1}^r \mu_j \quad \implies \quad \mu_j \in S \ \forall j. \tag{2.12}$$

This condition arises in studying the weights of $\bigwedge^\bullet \mathfrak{g}$. (This is related to abelian ideals, and we discuss connections in Remark 4.7.) It was shown in [KhRi] how Equation (2.12) extends the notion of the face of a polytope. We now further extend this notion. First we recall the notions of a weak face and a maximizer subset, via the characterization shown in [KhRi, Proposition 4.4].

**Definition 2.13.** Fix an $\mathbb{R}$-vector space $\mathbb{V}$, as well as subsets $X \subset \mathbb{V}$ and $R \subset \mathbb{R}$.

(1) Define the finitely supported $R$-valued functions on $X$ to be:

$$\operatorname{Fin}(X, R) := \{f : \mathbb{V} \to R \cup \{0\} : \operatorname{supp}(f) \subset X,\ \# \operatorname{supp}(f) < \infty\}, \tag{2.14}$$

where $\operatorname{supp}(f) := \{v \in \mathbb{V} : f(v) \neq 0\}$. Then $\operatorname{Fin}(X, R) \subset \operatorname{Fin}(\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{R})$ for all $X, R$.

(2) Define the maps $\ell : \operatorname{Fin}(\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\vec{\ell} : \operatorname{Fin}(\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R}\mathbb{V} = \mathbb{V}$ via:

$$\ell(f) := \sum_{x \in \mathbb{V}} f(x), \qquad \vec{\ell}(f) := \sum_{x \in \mathbb{V}} f(x)x. \tag{2.15}$$

(3) We say that $Y \subset X$ is a *weak $R$-face* of $X$ if for any $f \in \operatorname{Fin}(X, R_+)$ and $g \in \operatorname{Fin}(Y, R_+)$,

$$\ell(f) = \ell(g) > 0,\ \vec{\ell}(f) = \vec{\ell}(g) \implies \operatorname{supp}(f) \subset Y. \tag{2.16}$$

(4) Given $X \subset \mathbb{V}$ (where $\mathbb{V}$ is a real or complex vector space) and $\varphi \in \mathbb{V}^*$, define

$$X(\varphi) := \{x \in X : \varphi(x) - \varphi(x') \in \mathbb{R}_+ \ \forall x' \in X\}. \tag{2.17}$$

(Note that $\varphi$ is constant on $X(\varphi)$.)

**Remark 2.18.** Weak faces generalize the notion of faces in two ways: first, if $R = \mathbb{R}$ and $X \subset \mathbb{V}$ is convex, then a weak $\mathbb{R}$-face is the same as a face. Weak $R$-faces involve satisfying the same condition as (weak $\mathbb{R}$-)faces, but with a different set $R_+$ of coefficients. Second, the notion is defined (and will be used) for non-convex (in fact, discrete) subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Weak $R$-faces are very useful because they occur in many settings in representation theory and convexity theory; see Remark 4.6.

The following basic results on weak faces are straightforward.

**Lemma 2.19.** *Suppose $Y \subset X \subset \mathbb{V}$, a real or complex vector space, and $\varphi \in \mathbb{V}^*$. Then every (nonempty) $X(\varphi)$ is a weak $R$-face of $X$ for all $R \subset \mathbb{R}$. If $\mathbb{B} \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a subring, then $Y$ is a weak $\mathbb{B}$-face if and only if it is a weak $\mathbb{F}(\mathbb{B})$-face, where $\mathbb{F}(\mathbb{B})$ is the quotient field of $\mathbb{B}$.*

Now observe that the sets $S \subset \operatorname{wt} \mathfrak{g}$ satisfying Equation (2.12) are precisely the weak $\mathbb{Z}$-faces of $\operatorname{wt} \mathfrak{g} = \operatorname{wt} L(\theta) = \Phi \cup \{0\}$ (and hence the weak $\mathbb{Q}$-faces as well, by Lemma 2.19). In joint work [CKR] with Chari and Ridenour, the results in [CG1] were extended to obtain families of Koszul algebras using weak $\mathbb{Q}$-faces of arbitrary Weyl polytopes $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ (as opposed to $\mathcal{P}(\theta)$).

Thus, it is fruitful to understand and classify subsets $S$ satisfying (2.12). Chari et. al. [CDR] showed that such sets $S$ are precisely the set of weights on some face of $\mathcal{P}(\theta)$. Hence one has various seemingly distinct yet related ingredients in root polytopes: the faces of the polytope, the maximizer subsets $(\operatorname{wt} \mathfrak{g})(\xi)$, and the weak $\mathbb{Q}$-faces of $\operatorname{wt} \mathfrak{g}$. Although one observes in Remark 2.18 that weak $\mathbb{Q}$-faces (of $\operatorname{wt} L(\theta)$) are related to faces (of $\mathcal{P}(\theta)$), one would like more precise connections between these objects. Thus we showed with Ridenour that more generally, all of these notions are one and the same, in every Weyl polytope. Some of our results also extend those by Vinberg.

**Theorem 2.20** (Khare and Ridenour, [KhRi]; Chari et. al. [CDR]; Vinberg [Vi])**.** *For any $\lambda \in P^+$ and any subfield $\mathbb{F}$ of $\mathbb{R}$, the weak $\mathbb{F}$-faces $S$ of $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$ are precisely the maximizer subsets $S = (\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda))(\xi)$ for some $\xi \in P$. There is a bijection between such subsets $S$ and faces $F$ of the Weyl polytope $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$, sending $S$ to $F = \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}}(S)$, or equivalently, sending a face $F$ to $S = F \cap \operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$.*

Note that these results hold only for finite-dimensional highest weight modules. It is natural to ask if these results extend to all modules $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Another possible extension involves working not with a subring $\mathbb{Z}$ or subfield $\mathbb{F}$ of $\mathbb{R}$, but with an additive subgroup.

**Question 2.21.** Find connections as in Theorem 2.20, in an arbitrary highest weight module $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, for $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. Is it also possible to classify the weak $\mathbb{A}$-faces of $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, where $0 \neq \mathbb{A} \subset (\mathbb{R}, +)$ is an arbitrary nontrivial additive subgroup?

We completely answer these questions when $\lambda$ is not on a simple root hyperplane (for all $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$). We also answer them for all simple modules and parabolic Verma modules; see Theorem 3.

2.5. **Other connections.** The study of Weyl polytopes - and more generally, highest weight modules, their structure and combinatorics - has long been actively studied and continues to be so. Early results such as the character formulas of Weyl(-Kac) and Kostant, as well as more modern results such as Kazhdan-Lusztig theory and the theory of crystals, have yielded direct or algorithmic information about the characters and weights of various simple modules. Modern interest centers around crystal bases and canonical bases introduced by Kashiwara and Lusztig, which are a major development in combinatorial representation theory (see [HK] and its references), and are a widely used tool in representation theory, combinatorics, and mathematical physics.

We present two further connections to the literature. In the special case $\lambda = \theta$, the root polytope $\mathcal{P}(\theta)$ has been the focus of much recent interest because of its importance in the study of abelian and ad-nilpotent ideals of $\mathfrak{g}$ (or of $\mathfrak{b}^+$). These connections are described in Section 4. Root polytopes $\mathcal{P}(\theta)$ and their variants such as $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}}(\Phi^+ \cup \{0\})$ have been much studied for a variety of reasons: they are related to certain toric varieties, as discussed in [Chi, §1]. Moreover, their connections to combinatorics (e.g. computing the volumes of these polytopes, word lengths with respect to root systems, and growth series of root lattices via triangulations) were explored by Ardila et al., Mészáros, and even earlier by Gelfand-Graev-Postnikov. See [ABH, Me] and the references therein.

Weyl polytopes also have other connections to combinatorics and representation theory. For instance, a class of "pseudo-Weyl polytopes" (i.e., polytopes whose edges are parallel to roots) called Mirković-Vilonen (or MV) polytopes has recently been the focus of much research. These are the image under the moment map of certain projective varieties in the affine Grassmannian, called MV-cycles, which provide bases of finite-dimensional simple modules over the Langlands dual group via intersection homology. MV-cycles and polytopes (which include Weyl polytopes) are useful in understanding weight multiplicities and tensor product multiplicities, and also have connections to Lusztig's canonical basis. See for instance [And, Ka] for more details.

## 3. The main results

We now state the main results of this paper. These fall into three groups: the first set of results deals with the structure of $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ - such as identifying the set of (weak) faces. The second set deals with "uniqueness" properties such as when two faces are equal. Finally, we discuss two applications.

**Remark 3.1.** Although we work with arbitrary $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ (a complex vector space), the only sets we work with in this paper are (convex hulls of) subsets of $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ for various highest weight modules $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Thus, the convex hulls of these sets are merely translates (via the highest weight) of subsets of $-\mathbb{Z}_+\Delta$. This means that we essentially work in the real form $\mathfrak{h}^*_{\mathbb{R}} \cong \mathbb{R}^I$.

3.1. **Structural results.** We begin by establishing a "top" part for $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ that is a finite-dimensional simple module over a certain Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} + \mathfrak{g}_J$. This distinguished subset $J = J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda) \subset I$ of simple roots is used crucially in the remainder of the paper.

**Theorem 1.** *Given $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, and $J \subset I$, define $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda := \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda \cap (\lambda - \mathbb{Z}_+\Delta_J)$. There exists a unique subset $J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda) \subset I$ such that the following are equivalent: (a) $J \subset J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$; (b) $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is finite; (c) $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is $W_J$-stable; (d) $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is $W_J$-stable. In fact, if $\mathbb{V}^\lambda_\lambda$ is spanned by $v_\lambda$, then*

$$J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda) := \{i \in J_\lambda : (x^-_{\alpha_i})^{\lambda(h_i)+1} v_\lambda = 0\}. \tag{3.2}$$

*In particular, if $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is a parabolic Verma module $M(\lambda, J')$ for $J' \subset J_\lambda$ or a simple module $L(\lambda)$, then $J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda) = J'$ or $J_\lambda$ respectively.*

(For more equivalent conditions, see Proposition 5.4.) We will also see below that the subset $J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$ is closely related to the classification theory for simple weight modules by Fernando [Fe]. We show how to recover $J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$ from $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ in Proposition 8.3, thereby reconciling our results with those in [Fe].

As the next structural result shows, Theorem 1 leads to a complete understanding of $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ and its symmetries for all "(sub-)generic" highest weights $\lambda$. We first give these weights a name.

**Definition 3.3.** (1) Define $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ to be *simply-regular* if $(\lambda, \alpha_i) \neq 0$ for all $i \in I$. (2) A $\mathfrak{g}$-module $M$ is *pure* if for each $X \in \mathfrak{g}$, the set of $m \in M$ such that $\dim \mathbb{C}[X]m < \infty$ is either 0 or $M$.

Note that antidominant or even regular weights are simply-regular, and all simple $\mathfrak{g}$-modules are pure [Fe]. Now in stating the next result (and henceforth), by *extremal rays* at a vertex $v$ of a polyhedron $P$, we mean the infinite length edges of $P$ that pass through $v$.

**Theorem 2.** *Suppose* $(\lambda, \mathbb{V}^\lambda)$ *satisfy one of the following: (a)* $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ *is simply-regular and* $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ *is arbitrary; (b)* $|J_\lambda \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)| \leq 1$*; (c)* $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = M(\lambda, J')$ *for some* $J' \subset J_\lambda$*; or (d)* $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ *is pure.*
*Then the convex hull (in Euclidean space)* $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda \subset \lambda + \mathfrak{h}^*_{\mathbb{R}}$ *is a convex polyhedron with vertices* $W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda)$*, and the stabilizer subgroup in* $W$ *of both* $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ *and* $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ *is* $W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$*. If* $\lambda$ *is simply-regular, the extremal rays at the vertex* $\lambda$ *are* $\{\lambda - \mathbb{R}_+\alpha_i \ : \ i \notin J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)\}$.

**Remark 3.4.** Consequently, the notion of the Weyl polytope extends to arbitrary simple highest weight modules, via: $\mathcal{P}(\lambda) := \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} L(\lambda) = \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J_\lambda)$. Note that one now obtains a polyhedron (which is a polytope if and only if $\lambda \in P^+$, in which case $J(L(\lambda)) = J_\lambda = I$). Even more generally, one can define $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{V}^\lambda) := \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda))$; this is a $W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$-invariant convex polyhedron, which equals $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ when $\lambda$ is simply-regular, or $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = L(\lambda), M(\lambda, J')$. Moreover, it is a (possibly non-lattice) *pseudo-Weyl polyhedron*, in the spirit of [Ka, §2.3].

**Remark 3.5.** Most or all of the results along the lines of this section were only known for generalized/parabolic Verma modules. Hence they do not address the "nontrivial" $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$, where $\lambda$ is not on countably many affine hyperplanes in $\mathfrak{h}^*$ (i.e., not antidominant). We can now work also with all simple modules $L(\lambda)$, as well as all $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ when $\lambda$ is not on the finite set of simple root hyperplanes.

The next main "structural" result is used to unify and extend various results in the references. Henceforth, the notions of polyhedra, polytopes, faces, and supporting hyperplanes are used without reference. See [KhRi, §2.5] for definitions and results such as the Decomposition Theorem.

**Theorem 3.** *Suppose* $(\lambda, \mathbb{V}^\lambda)$ *satisfy one of the following: (a)* $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ *is simply-regular and* $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ *is arbitrary; (b)* $|J_\lambda \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)| \leq 1$*; (c)* $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = M(\lambda, J')$ *for some* $J' \subset J_\lambda$*; or (d)* $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ *is pure.*
*The following are equivalent for a nonempty subset* $Y \subset \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$*:*

1. $Y = (\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda)(\varphi)$ *for some* $\varphi \in \mathfrak{h}$ *(i.e.,* $Y$ *is the set of weights on some supporting hyperplane).*
2. $Y \subset \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ *is a weak* $\mathbb{A}$*-face.*
3. *There exist* $w \in W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$ *and* $J \subset I$ *such that* $Y = w(\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda)$.
4. *(If* $\lambda$ *is simply-regular, then these are also equivalent to:)* $Y \cap \operatorname{wt}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ *is nonempty, and if* $y_1 + y_2 = \mu_1 + \mu_2$ *for* $y_i \in Y, \mu_i \in \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$*, then* $\mu_i \in Y$ *as well.*

This theorem at once characterizes and classifies all subsets of weights that are weak $\mathbb{Z}$-faces (as in [CDR, CG1, CKR]), weak $\mathbb{F}$-faces (as in [KhRi]), and the faces (in Euclidean space, as in [Vi, KhRi]) of the convex hull of $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Moreover, all of the references mentioned involved finite-dimensional simple modules; but these constitute a special case of our result, where $\lambda \in P^+$, $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = L(\lambda)$, $J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda) = I$, and $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{Z}$ or $\mathbb{F}$. In contrast, Theorem 3 holds for all simple $L(\lambda)$ as well as all highest weight modules for simply-regular $\lambda$, for all subgroups $\mathbb{A} \subset \mathbb{R}$ - and it is independent of $\mathbb{A}$.

**Remark 3.6.** The last condition (4) in Theorem 3 is *a priori* far weaker than being a weak $\mathbb{Z}$-face; it was also considered by Chari et al. in [CDR] for $\operatorname{wt} \mathfrak{g}$. It is easy to see by Lemma 4.9 below that there are many “intermediate” conditions of closedness that are implied by (2) and imply (4) in Theorem 3; thus, they are all equivalent to (2) as well.

3.2. **Characterizations of weak faces.** Our next theorem discusses redundancy issues for maximizer subsets $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Note that certain results in [KhRi] and [Vi] addressed the question: given $\lambda \in P^+$, when are two faces of the weight polytope of $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$ equal? By Theorems 2 and 3 and results in [KhRi], this translates to asking when two weak $\mathbb{Z}$-faces of $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$ - i.e., $W$-translates of subsets $\operatorname{wt}_J L(\lambda)$ - are equal. We completely resolve this question for all highest weight modules $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$, including one characterization purely in terms of sets of simple roots and Dynkin diagrams.

**Theorem 4.** *Given $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, and $J \subset I$, there exist unique subsets $J_{\min}, J_{\max} \subset J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$ which depend only on $J \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$, such that the following are equivalent for $J' \subset I$:*

1. *There exist $w, w' \in W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$ such that $w(\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda) = w'(\operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda)$.*
2. $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$.
3. *$J \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda) = J' \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$ and $W_{J\cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda) = W_{J'\cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda)$.*
4. *$J \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda) = J' \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$ and $J_{\min} \subset J' \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda) \subset J_{\max}$.*
5. *$J \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda) = J' \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$, and $J \cap J' \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$ contains all connected graph components of the Dynkin (sub)diagrams of $J \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda), J' \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda) \subset I$, which contain some $i \in I$ such that $(\lambda, \alpha_i) \neq 0$.*

For more equivalent conditions in the special case when $J, J' \subset J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$, see Proposition 7.2. Also note that we use $w, w' \in W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$ instead of all $W$. This is because by Theorem 1, $W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$ is the largest parabolic subgroup of $W$ that preserves $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$.

**Remark 3.7.** Vinberg showed (an equivalent statement to) (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (2) in [Vi, Proposition 3.2], in the special case when $J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda) = I$, i.e., $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is finite-dimensional. In the same setting, we showed with Ridenour in [KhRi, Theorem 4] by an alternate method that (2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (3). Moreover, that (2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (4) generalizes [CM, Proposition 5.9], which was proved for the adjoint representation $\lambda = \theta$, $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = L(\theta) = \mathfrak{g}$, $J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda) = I$. Theorem 4 unites all of these results - and proves them for all $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$.

**Remark 3.8.** Vinberg showed in [Vi] that every face of the Weyl polytope $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ is a $W$-translate of a unique dominant face $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)(\mu)$ for some dominant $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+\Omega$. Using Theorems 3 and 4, it is clear how to extend this to all $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ for simply-regular $\lambda$ and to all simple $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = L(\lambda)$. It is not hard to show in this case that the map $Y \mapsto \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} Y$ is a bijection from the set of weak $\mathbb{Z}$-faces of $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ to the set of faces of $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, with inverse map $F \mapsto F \cap \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. See Proposition 8.7.

We also provide an “intrinsic” characterization of the weak faces of $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ that are *finite*, thereby generalizing results for finite-dimensional modules $L(\lambda)$ in [CDR, KhRi]. See Theorem 5.6.

3.3. **Applications.** We now mention two applications of these results and the methods used to prove them. Note by Theorem 2 that $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} L(\lambda) = \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J_\lambda)$ for all weights $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. This leads back to our original motivation in analyzing the convex hull of weights of modules $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$:

- To compute the set of weights of all simple modules $L(\lambda)$.
- To determine whether [Ha, Theorem 7.41] holds more generally for all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$:

$$\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda) = (\lambda - \mathbb{Z}\Delta) \cap \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} L(\lambda).$$

Some reductions are known. For instance, as per [Hu, Chapter 7], translation functors can be used to reduce computing the formal character of simple modules $L(\lambda)$ for semisimple $\mathfrak{g}$ to the principal blocks $\mathcal{O}_0$ for all $\mathfrak{g}$. A more involved approach uses Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials; see [Hu, Chapter 8] for a comprehensive treatment of this subject.

We now provide a complete resolution of both of the above questions using the methods in this paper. Thus, the following result provides explicit formulas to compute the set of weights of all simple modules $L(\lambda)$, all parabolic Verma modules $M(\lambda, J')$, and other modules $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ as well.

**Theorem 5.** *Fix $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, and suppose $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is such that $|J_\lambda \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)| \leq 1$, or $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = M(\lambda, J')$ for some $J' \subset J_\lambda$. Then,*

$$\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = (\lambda - \mathbb{Z}\Delta) \cap \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \operatorname{wt} L_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda) - \mathbb{Z}_+(\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi^+_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}) = \coprod_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \Delta_{I \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}} \operatorname{wt} L_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda - \mu). \tag{3.9}$$

Note that the last expression in Equation (3.9) corresponds to the $\mathfrak{g}_{J'}$-integrability of $M(\lambda, J')$, as discussed in [Hu, Chapter 9], while the first equality extends [Ha, Theorem 7.41] to all parabolic Verma modules. We also show in Theorem 6.2 that Equation (3.9) is false for general $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$. However, by Theorem 1, it holds for all simple modules:

**Corollary 3.10.** *Equation* (3.9) *holds upon replacing $J'$ by $J_\lambda$ and $M(\lambda, J')$ by $L(\lambda)$.*

We also extend the Weyl Character Formula to simple highest weight modules $L(\lambda)$ for other $\lambda \notin P^+$. See Theorem 6.5.

The final application is "dual" to Theorem 1 in the following sense: Theorem 1 identifies a "largest parabolic subgroup of symmetries" given a highest weight module. Dually, it is possible to identify a largest and a smallest highest weight module, given a parabolic group of symmetries.

**Theorem 6.** *Fix $\lambda$ and $J' \subset J_\lambda$ such that either $\lambda$ is simply-regular, or $J' = \emptyset$ or $J_\lambda$. There exist unique "largest" and "smallest" highest weight modules $M_{\max}(\lambda, J'), M_{\min}(\lambda, J')$ such that the following are equivalent for a nonzero module $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$:*

1. $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J')$.
2. *The stabilizer subgroup in $W$ of* $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ *is $W_{J'}$.*
3. *The largest parabolic subgroup of $W$ that preserves* $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ *is $W_{J'}$.*
4. $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow M_{\max}(\lambda, J') \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda \twoheadrightarrow M_{\min}(\lambda, J')$.

## 4. Classifying (positive) weak faces for simply-regular highest weights

In this section, we study (weak) faces of $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ for all modules $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ with simply-regular $\lambda$. This provides alternate proofs of the main results of [Vi, KhRi], which in contrast were known only for finite-dimensional $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$. The proofs in this section are algebraic/combinatorial. Thus they differ from previous papers in that they are case-free as opposed to the case-by-case analysis in [CDR], and use neither the Decomposition Theorem for convex polyhedra [KhRi, §2.5], nor the geometry of the Weyl group action as in [Vi].

In this section we consider several combinatorial conditions among subsets of $\operatorname{wt} \mathfrak{g}$ (some not yet mentioned in this paper), which were studied by Chari and her co-authors in [CDR, CG1], as well as in joint works [CKR, KhRi] by the author. To state these conditions for general $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$, some additional notation is needed.

**Definition 4.1.** Let $X$ be a subset of a real vector space, and $R \subset \mathbb{R}$ be any (nonempty) subset.

1. $Y \subset X$ is a *positive weak $R$-face* if for any $f \in \operatorname{Fin}(X, R_+)$ and $g \in \operatorname{Fin}(Y, R_+)$,
$$\vec{\ell}(f) = \vec{\ell}(g) \implies \ell(g) \leq \ell(f), \tag{4.2}$$
with equality if and only if $\operatorname{supp}(f) \subset Y$. Note that this definition is consistent with the notation and results in [KhRi], via [KhRi, Proposition 4.4].
2. Given $R, R' \subset \mathbb{R}$, we say that $Y \subset X$ is $(R', R)$-*closed* if given $f \in \operatorname{Fin}(X, R)$, $g \in \operatorname{Fin}(Y, R)$,
$$\ell(f) = \ell(g) \in R' \setminus \{0\}, \ \vec{\ell}(f) = \vec{\ell}(g) \implies \operatorname{supp}(f) \subset Y. \tag{4.3}$$
3. Define the *$R$-convex hull* of $X$ to be the image under $\vec{\ell}$ of $\{f \in \operatorname{Fin}(X, R \cap [0,1]) : \ell(f) = 1\}$. This will be denoted by $\operatorname{conv}_R(X)$.

(Positive) weak $\mathbb{Z}$-faces were studied and used in [CDR, CG1, KhRi]. Weak $R$-faces are the same as $(\mathbb{R}, R_+)$-closed subsets. Moreover, the "usual" convex hull of a set $X$ is simply $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}}(X)$.

The goal of this section is to partially prove Theorem 3. More precisely, we classify the (positive) weak faces of $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ that contain the vertex $\lambda$. Later, Theorems 2 and 3 will help avoid the restriction of containing $\lambda$.) Here are the main results in this section.

**Theorem 4.4.** *Given $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ with highest weight space $\mathbb{V}^\lambda_\lambda = \mathbb{C} v_\lambda$,*

$$\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda = (\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda)(\rho_{I \setminus J}) = \operatorname{wt} U(\mathfrak{g}_J) v_\lambda \ \forall J \subset I.$$

*Now fix an additive subgroup $0 \neq \mathbb{A} \subset (\mathbb{R}, +)$, and a subset $Y \subset \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ that contains $\lambda$. Then each part implies the next:*

1. *There exists a (unique) subset $J \subset I$, such that $Y = \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$.*
2. *$Y = (\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda)(\varphi)$ for some $\varphi \in \mathfrak{h}$.*
3. *$Y$ is a weak $\mathbb{A}$-face of $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$.*
4. *$Y$ is $(\{2\}, \{1, 2\})$-closed in $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$.*

*If $\lambda - \alpha_i \in \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ for all $i \in I$, then these are all equivalent.*

Thus, we are able to classify the weak $\mathbb{A}$-faces of $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ that contain $\lambda$, for such $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$. By Corollary 4.15 below, this includes all $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ for all simply-regular $\lambda$. Moreover, the result shows that the weak $\mathbb{A}$-faces of $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ containing $\lambda$ can be described independently of $\mathbb{A}$.

For completeness, we also classify which of these weak $\mathbb{A}$-faces (from Theorem 4.4) are positive weak $\mathbb{A}$-faces. (By Proposition 4.10 below, every positive weak $\mathbb{A}$-face is necessarily a weak $\mathbb{A}$-face.)

**Theorem 4.5.** *Fix $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, $J \subset I$, and an additive subgroup $0 \neq \mathbb{A} \subset (\mathbb{R}, +)$. Then $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is a positive weak $\mathbb{A}$-face of $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ if exactly one of the following occurs:*

- *$\lambda \notin \mathbb{A}\Delta$ and $J \subset I$ is arbitrary, or*
- *$\lambda \in \mathbb{A}\Delta$, and there exists $j_0 \notin J$ such that $(\lambda, \omega_{j_0}) > 0$.*

*The converse holds if $\lambda - \alpha_i \in \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda \ \forall i \in I$ and $a\mathbb{A} \subset \mathbb{A}$ for some $0 \neq a \in \mathbb{A}$ (e.g., $\mathbb{Z} \cap \mathbb{A} \neq 0$).*

Thus, while the weak $\mathbb{A}$-faces of $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ are independent of $\mathbb{A}$, the same cannot be said of the positive weak $\mathbb{A}$-faces. Also note that the last assumption is clearly satisfied if $\mathbb{Z} \cap \mathbb{A} \neq 0$.

### 4.1. Basic properties of closedness.

In [CDR, CG1], Chari et al. discuss various combinatorial conditions, and study the sets of roots in $\operatorname{wt} \mathfrak{g} = \Phi \cup \{0\}$ that satisfy these conditions. These include the condition of being a weak $\mathbb{Z}$-face as well as of being a positive weak $\mathbb{Z}$-face (which were then studied in all Weyl polytopes in [CKR]). Another result from [CDR] is as follows:

*"A proper subset $Y \subset \Phi^+$ is a weak $\mathbb{Z}$-face if and only if: $\alpha + \beta, \alpha + \beta - \gamma \notin \Phi \ \forall \alpha, \beta \in Y, \gamma \in \Phi \setminus Y$."*

In other words, $(Y + Y) \cap \Phi = (Y + Y) \cap [\Phi + (\Phi \setminus Y)] = \emptyset$. It is natural to ask how to extend this condition to arbitrary modules $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$. To do so, note that $0 \in \operatorname{wt} L(\theta) \setminus Y$, so that the above condition is equivalent to the following:

$$(Y + Y) \cap (\operatorname{wt} \mathfrak{g} + \{0\}) = (Y + Y) \cap [\Phi + (\Phi \setminus Y)] = \emptyset.$$

In other words, $0 \notin Y \subset \operatorname{wt} \mathfrak{g}$ is $(\{2\}, \{1, 2\})$-closed. In Theorems 3 and 4.4, we study this condition in a general highest weight module.

**Remark 4.6.** The notion of $(R', R_+)$-closedness thus occurs in the literature for various $R', R \subset \mathbb{R}$:

- $R = \mathbb{F}$ and $R' \supset \mathbb{F}_+$ for a subfield $\mathbb{F} \subset \mathbb{R}$ (as in weak $\mathbb{F}$-faces in [KhRi]).
- $R = \mathbb{Z}$ and $R' \supset \mathbb{Z}_+$; this is used in [CDR, CG1, CKR, KhRi].
- We address all of these (above) cases by working in greater generality in this paper, with $R = \mathbb{A}$ and $R' \supset \mathbb{A}_+$ for an additive subgroup $0 \neq \mathbb{A} \subset (\mathbb{R}, +)$ (as in weak $\mathbb{A}$-faces).
- $R = R' = \mathbb{R}$ occurs in convexity theory and linear programming, when one works with faces of polytopes and polyhedra, which are precisely intersections with supporting hyperplanes.

- $R' = \{2\}$ and $R = \{1, 2\}$ or $\{0, 1, 2\}$ (as in in [CDR]).

**Remark 4.7.** Another combinatorial condition involves subsets $\Psi \subset \Phi^+$ that satisfy:

$$(\Psi + \Psi) \cap \Phi = \emptyset, \qquad (\Psi + \Phi^+) \cap \Phi \subset \Psi. \tag{4.8}$$

Such subsets $\Psi$ are precisely the *abelian ideals* of $\Phi^+$. Abelian and ad-nilpotent ideals connect affine Lie algebras/Weyl groups, the algebra $\bigwedge^\bullet \mathfrak{g}$ of Maurer-Cartan left-invariant differential forms, combinatorial conditions on sets of roots, and other areas. Recent interest in abelian ideals can be traced back to the seminal work of Kostant (and Peterson) [Ko2] where he showed that abelian ideals were intricately connected to Cartan decompositions and discrete series. They have since attracted much attention, including by Cellini-Papi [CP], Chari-Dolbin-Ridenour [CDR], Panyushev [Pa] (and Röhrle [PR]), and Suter [Su].

Although we do not discuss further connections to abelian ideals in this paper, we remark that they have several combinatorial properties, such as the characterization via Equation (4.8). Kostant showed in [Ko1, Theorem 7] that the map sending an abelian ideal $\Psi$ to $\sum_{\mu \in \Psi} \mu \in P$ is one-to-one and yields the highest weights of certain irreducible summands of the finite-dimensional $\mathfrak{g}$-module $\bigwedge^\bullet \mathfrak{g}$. Moreover, it is easy to check that Equation (4.8) is satisfied by all subsets $\operatorname{wt}_J L(\theta)$ for $J \subsetneq I$. In particular, the abelian ideal $\operatorname{wt}_J L(\theta)$ was denoted in [CDR] by $\mathfrak{i}_0$ and is the unique "minimal" ad-nilpotent ideal in the corresponding parabolic Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{p}_J$ of $\mathfrak{g}$.

We now present a few basic results on (positive) weak faces and closedness, which are used to prove Theorems 4.4 and 4.5. The following are straightforward by using the definitions.

**Lemma 4.9.** *Fix subsets $R, R' \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $0 < a \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose $Y \subset X \subset \mathbb{V}$, a real vector space.*

1. *If $Y \subset X$ is $(R', R)$-closed and $X_1 \subset X$ is nonempty, then $Y \cap X_1 \subset X_1$ is $(R'_1, R_1)$-closed, where $R'_1 \subset a \cdot R'$ and $R_1 \subset a \cdot R$.*
2. *For any $v \in \mathbb{V}$, $Y \subset X$ is $(R', R)$-closed if and only if $v \pm aY \subset v \pm aX$ is $(R', R)$-closed.*
3. *For all $\varphi \in \mathbb{V}^*$, $X(\varphi)$ is $(R', R_+)$-closed in $X$ for all $R, R' \subset \mathbb{R}$.*
4. *Given an invertible linear transformation $T \in GL(\mathbb{V})$, $T(Y) \subset T(X)$ is a (positive) weak $\mathbb{A}$-face or $(R', R)$-closed, if and only if $Y \subset X$ is also thus.*
5. *If $\varphi(x) \in (0, \infty)$ for some $x \in X$, then $X(\varphi)$ is a positive weak $R$-face of $X$.*

Next, if $R = R' = \mathbb{F}_+$ for a subfield $\mathbb{F} \subset \mathbb{R}$, then results in [KhRi] relate weak $\mathbb{F}$-faces and positive weak $\mathbb{F}$-faces. We now show this more generally (and add another equivalent condition) for $\mathbb{A}$.

**Proposition 4.10.** *Fix $Y \subset X \subset \mathbb{V}$ (a real vector space) and an additive subgroup $0 \neq \mathbb{A} \subset (\mathbb{R}, +)$. The following are equivalent:*

1. *$Y$ is a positive weak $\mathbb{A}$-face of $X$.*
2. *$0 \notin Y$, and $Y$ is a weak $\mathbb{A}$-face of $X \cup \{0\}$ - i.e.,*

$$\sum_{x \in X} a_x x + c \cdot 0 = \sum_{y \in Y} b_y y \in \mathbb{A}_+ X \bigcap \mathbb{A}_+ Y, \ a_x, b_y, c \in \mathbb{A}_+ \ \forall x, y, \quad c + \sum_x a_x = \sum_y b_y$$
$$\implies \quad c = 0, \quad x \in Y \text{ if } a_x > 0.$$

3. *$Y$ is a weak $\mathbb{A}$-face of $X$ and $X \cup \{0\}$; $0$ is not a nontrivial $\mathbb{A}_+$-linear combination of $Y$.*

If $1 \in \mathbb{A}$, then the last part of (3) can be replaced by: $0 \notin \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{A}}(Y)$; the proof would be similar.

*Proof.* We prove a cyclic chain of implications. First assume (1), and choose $0 < a \in \mathbb{A}$. If $0 \in Y$, then define $f(0) = a$, $g(0) = 2a$, and $f(x) = g(x) = 0 \ \forall x \in \mathbb{V} \setminus \{0\}$. Then $\vec{\ell}(f) = 0 = \vec{\ell}(g)$, but $\ell(f) = a < 2a = \ell(g)$, which contradicts the definitions. Hence $0 \notin Y$. Now suppose $\vec{\ell}(f) = \vec{\ell}(g)$ and $\ell(f) = \ell(g)$ for $f \in \operatorname{Fin}(X \cup \{0\}, \mathbb{A}_+)$ and $g \in \operatorname{Fin}(Y, \mathbb{A}_+)$. Set $f_1 := f$ on $X \setminus \{0\}$ and $f_1(0) := 0$; then $\vec{\ell}(f_1) = \vec{\ell}(f) = \vec{\ell}(g)$, but $\ell(f_1) \leq \ell(f) = \ell(g)$. By (1), $\ell(f_1) = \ell(g) = \ell(f)$ and $\operatorname{supp}(f_1) \subset Y$. But then $f(0) = 0$, whence $f \equiv f_1$ and $\operatorname{supp}(f) \subset Y$ as well. This proves (2).

Now assume (2). Since $Y$ is a weak $\mathbb{A}$-face of $X \cup \{0\}$ and $Y \subset X$, hence $Y$ is a weak $\mathbb{A}$-face of $X$ from the definitions. It remains to show that $0 \neq \vec{\ell}(f)$ for any $0 \neq f \in \operatorname{Fin}(Y, \mathbb{A}_+)$. Suppose otherwise; then $0 = \sum_i r_i y_i$, where (finitely many) $0 < r_i \in \mathbb{A}$, and $y_i \in Y$ are pairwise distinct. Now define $f(0) := \sum_i r_i$ and $g(y_i) := r_i$ for all $i$ (and $f, g$ are 0 at all other points). Then $\vec{\ell}(f) = 0 = \vec{\ell}(g)$ and $\ell(f) = \sum_i r_i = \ell(g)$, so $\operatorname{supp}(f) = \{0\} \subset Y$, which is a contradiction.

Finally, we show that (3) $\implies$ (1). Suppose $\vec{\ell}(f) = \vec{\ell}(g)$ for $f \in \operatorname{Fin}(X, \mathbb{A}_+)$ and $g \in \operatorname{Fin}(Y, \mathbb{A}_+)$. If $\ell(g) > \ell(f)$, then define $f_1(0) := f(0) + \ell(g) - \ell(f)$, and $f_1 := f$ otherwise. Then $\vec{\ell}(f_1) = \vec{\ell}(f) = \vec{\ell}(g)$, and $\ell(f_1) = \ell(g)$. Since $Y \subset X \cup \{0\}$ is a weak $\mathbb{A}$-face, hence $\operatorname{supp}(f_1) \subset Y$. But then $0 \in Y$. Now choose $0 < a \in \mathbb{A}$; then $0 = a \cdot 0$ is a nontrivial $\mathbb{A}_+$-linear combination of $Y$. This is a contradiction, so $\ell(g) \leq \ell(f)$. Now suppose $\ell(g) = \ell(f)$; since $Y \subset X$ is a weak $\mathbb{A}$-face, hence $\operatorname{supp}(f) \subset Y$ as desired. Conversely, if $\operatorname{supp}(f) \subset Y$, then define $f_1(0) := f(0) + \ell(f) - \ell(g)$, and $f_1 := f$ otherwise. Now $\vec{\ell}(f_1) = \vec{\ell}(f) = \vec{\ell}(g)$ and $\ell(f_1) = \ell(g)$. Since $Y \subset X \cup \{0\}$ is a weak $\mathbb{A}$-face, hence $\operatorname{supp}(f_1) \subset Y$. Moreover, $0 = a \cdot 0 \notin Y$ by assumption (for any $0 < a \in \mathbb{A}$). Hence $f_1(0) = 0$, whence $\ell(f) = \ell(g)$ (and $f(0) = 0$), and (1) is proved. $\square$

**Remark 4.11.** We briefly digress to explain the choice of notation $\ell, \vec{\ell}$. Let $G$ be an abelian group and $X \subset G$ a set of generators. The associated Cayley graph is the quiver $Q_X(G)$ with set of vertices $G$, and edges $g \to gx$ for all $g \in G,\ x \in X$. Similarly one defines $Q_X(G)$ for all $X \subset G$.

Given $g, h \in G$ and $X \subset G$, let $\mathcal{P}_X(g,h)$ be the set of paths in $Q_X(G)$ from $g$ to $h$, and let $\mathcal{P}_X^n(g,h)$ be the subset of paths of length $n$. One can then define the same notions: $\ell : \operatorname{Fin}(X, \mathbb{Z}_+) \to \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $\vec{\ell} : \operatorname{Fin}(X, \mathbb{Z}_+) \to G$ in this setting as well. Now $\ell, \vec{\ell}$ act on paths, as long as they are considered to be finite sets of edges together with multiplicities. (Note that we may add them in any order, since $G$ is assumed to be abelian.) It is now clear that $\ell$ takes such a path to its "$X$-length", and $\vec{\ell}$ to the "displacement" in $G$. This explains the choice of notation.

We now reinterpret the notions of (positive) weak $\mathbb{Z}$-faces of $X$. Given $Y \subset X \subset G$, it is easy to see that $Y$ is a weak $\mathbb{Z}$-face of $X$ if and only if for all $n > 0$,

$$\mathcal{P}_Y^n(g,h) \neq \emptyset \implies \mathcal{P}_X^n(g,h) = \mathcal{P}_Y^n(g,h),$$

and $Y$ is a positive weak $\mathbb{Z}$-face of $X$ if and only if $Y$ "detects geodesics":

$$\mathcal{P}_Y(g,h) \neq \emptyset \implies \mathcal{P}_X^{min}(g,h) = \mathcal{P}_Y(g,h),$$

where $\mathcal{P}_X^{min}(g,h)$ is the set of geodesics (i.e., paths of minimal length) from $g$ to $h$ in $Q_X(G)$. In particular, note that all paths in $Q_Y(G)$ (i.e., in $\mathcal{P}_Y(g,h)$) must have the same length.

## 4.2. **Proof of the results.**

We now show Theorems 4.4 and 4.5. To do so, a better understanding of the sets $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is needed. Also recall the following standard notation: a weight vector $m \in M_\lambda$ in a $\mathfrak{g}$-module $M$ is *maximal* if $\mathfrak{n}^+ m = 0$. In this case $M(\lambda)$ maps into $M$, i.e., $[M : L(\lambda)] > 0$.

**Lemma 4.12.** *Suppose $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ (with highest weight space $\mathbb{C}v_\lambda$) and $\mu \in \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, for some $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and $J \subset I$. Then there exist $\mu_j \in \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ such that (in the standard partial order on $\mathfrak{h}^*$,)*

$$\lambda = \mu_0 > \mu_1 > \cdots > \mu_N = \mu, \qquad \mu_j - \mu_{j+1} \in \Delta_J\ \forall j, \qquad N \geq 0.$$

*Moreover, if $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = L(\lambda)$ is simple, then so is the $\mathfrak{g}_J$-submodule $\mathbb{V}_J^\lambda := U(\mathfrak{g}_J)v_\lambda$.*

In fact, it turns out that a more general phenomenon is true. See Theorem A.3 in the appendix.

*Proof.* Given $\mu \in \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, $0 \neq \mathbb{V}_\mu^\lambda = U(\mathfrak{n}^-)_{\mu-\lambda} v_\lambda$, and every such weight vector in $U(\mathfrak{n}^-)$ is a linear combination of Lie words generated by the $x_{\alpha_i}^-$ (with $\alpha_i \in \Delta$). Hence there is some $f$ in the subalgebra $R := \mathbb{C}\langle\{x_{\alpha_i}^-\}\rangle$ of $U(\mathfrak{n}^-) \subset U(\mathfrak{g})$, such that $f v_\lambda \neq 0$. Writing $f$ as a $\mathbb{C}$-linear combination of monomial words (each of weight $\mu - \lambda$) in this image $R$ of the free algebra on

$\{x_{\alpha_i}^- : i \in I\}$, at least one such monomial word $x_{\alpha_{i_N}}^- \cdots x_{\alpha_{i_2}}^- x_{\alpha_{i_1}}^-$ does not kill $v_\lambda$ (with $i_j \in I \ \forall j$). Hence $\mu_j := \operatorname{wt}(x_{\alpha_{i_j}}^- x_{\alpha_{i_{j-1}}}^- \cdots x_{\alpha_{i_1}}^- v_\lambda) \in \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ for all $j$. Since $\mu \in \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda \subset \lambda - \mathbb{Z}_+ \Delta_J$ and $\Delta$ is a basis of $\mathfrak{h}^*$, hence $\mu_j \in \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ and $\mu_j - \mu_{j+1} = \alpha_{i_{j+1}} \in \Delta_J$ for all $j < N$. This shows the first part.

To show the second statement, suppose $\mathbb{V}_J^\lambda$ is not a simple $\mathfrak{g}_J$-module. Define $\mathfrak{n}_J^\pm$ to be the Lie subalgebra generated by $\{x_{\alpha_j}^\pm : j \in J\}$. Then there exists a maximal vector $v_\mu$ (with $\mu \neq \lambda$) in the weight space $(\mathbb{V}_J^\lambda)_\mu = U(\mathfrak{n}_J^-)_{\mu - \lambda} v_\lambda$, which is killed by all of $\mathfrak{n}_J^+$. By the Serre relations, $v_\mu$ is also a maximal vector in $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$, since $\mathfrak{n}_{I \setminus J}^+$ commutes with $\mathfrak{n}_J^-$. Since $\mu \neq \lambda$, $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is not simple either. □

We now show the main results in this section.

*Proof of Theorem 4.4.* Define $\mathbb{V}_J^\lambda$ as in Lemma 4.12. Then one inclusion for the first claim is obvious: $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}_J^\lambda \subset \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Conversely, given $\mu \in \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, the proof of Lemma 4.12 implies that $\mathbb{V}_\mu^\lambda$ is spanned by monomial words in $\mathfrak{n}_J^-$ applied to $v_\lambda$. In particular, $\mu \in \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}_J^\lambda$, as desired. Now $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is contained in $\lambda - \mathbb{Z}_+ \Delta_J$, and $\rho_{I \setminus J} \in P^+$. This easily shows that if $\mu \in \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda \subset \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda)$, then $(\lambda, \rho_{I \setminus J}) - (\mu, \rho_{I \setminus J}) \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, with equality if and only if $\mu \in \lambda - \mathbb{Z}_+ \Delta_J$. Thus,

$$\operatorname{wt} U(\mathfrak{g}_J) v_\lambda = \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}_J^\lambda = \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda = (\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda)(\rho_{I \setminus J}). \tag{4.13}$$

Next, clearly (1) $\implies$ (2) $\implies$ (3) $\implies$ (4) by Equation (4.13) and Lemma 4.9 (dividing by any $0 < a \in \mathbb{A}$). Now assume (4), as well as that $\lambda - \alpha_i \in \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda \ \forall i \in I$. Define $J := \{i \in I : \lambda - \alpha_i \in Y\}$. We claim that $Y = \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, which proves (1). To see the claim, first suppose that $\mu \in \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. By Lemma 4.12, there exist $\mu_0 = \lambda > \mu_1 > \cdots > \mu_N = \mu$ such that $\mu_{i-1} - \mu_i = \alpha_{l_i} \in \Delta_J$ for all $1 \leq i \leq N$. Then $l_i \in J$ and $\lambda - \alpha_{l_i} \in Y$ for all $i$. We claim that $\mu = \mu_N \in Y$ by induction on $N$. First, this is true for $N = 0, 1$ by assumption. Now if $\mu_0, \dots, \mu_{k-1} \in Y$, then

$$\mu_0 + \mu_k = \mu_{k-1} + (\lambda - \alpha_{l_k}).$$

Since both terms on the right are in $Y$, and $Y$ is $(\{2\}, \{1, 2\})$-closed in $X$, hence so are the terms on the left, and the claim follows by induction. This proves one inclusion: $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda \subset Y$.

Now choose any weight $\mu = \lambda - \sum_{i \in I} n_i \alpha_i \in Y$. Again by Lemma 4.12, there exist weights $\mu_0 = \lambda > \mu_1 > \cdots > \mu_N = \mu$ with $\mu_{i-1} - \mu_i = \alpha_{l_i}$ for some $l_i \in I$. The next step is to show that all $\mu_i \in Y$ and all $l_i \in J$, by downward induction on $i$. To begin, $\mu_{N-1} + (\lambda - \alpha_{l_N}) = \mu_0 + \mu_N = \lambda + \mu$. Since both terms on the right are in $Y$, so are the terms on the left. Continue by induction, as above. This argument shows that if $n_i > 0$ for any $i$ (in the definition of $\mu$ above), then $\lambda - \alpha_i \in Y$, so $i \in J$. But then $\mu = \lambda - \sum_{i \,:\, n_i > 0} n_i \alpha_i \in \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, as desired. □

We conclude this part by showing the other main result in this section.

*Proof of Theorem 4.5.* In this proof, we repeatedly use Proposition 4.10 without necessarily referring to it henceforth. Set $Y := \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda \subset X = \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$.

First suppose that $\lambda \notin \mathbb{A}\Delta$, and $J \subset I$ is arbitrary. One easily checks that $0 \notin \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, so it suffices to show that $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is a weak $\mathbb{A}$-face of $\{0\} \cup \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Suppose $\sum_{y \in Y} m_y y = \sum_{x \in X} r_x x + (\sum_y m_y - \sum_x r_x) 0$, with $\sum_y m_y \geq \sum_x r_x$ and all $m_y, r_x \in \mathbb{A}_+$. Then we have:

$$\sum_y m_y (\lambda - y) = \sum_x r_x (\lambda - x) + (\sum_y m_y - \sum_x r_x) \lambda.$$

The left side is in $\mathbb{A}_+ \Delta_J$, whence so is the right side. Now $\lambda - x \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \Delta$ and $\lambda \notin \mathbb{A}\Delta$, so by the independence of $\Delta$, $\sum_y m_y = \sum_x r_x$ and $\lambda - x \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \Delta_J$ whenever $r_x > 0$. In particular, $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is a weak $\mathbb{A}$-face of $\{0\} \cup \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, and we are done by Proposition 4.10.

If $\lambda \in \mathbb{A}\Delta$ instead, fix $j_0 \notin J$ such that $(\lambda, \omega_{j_0}) > 0$. For all $\mu = \lambda - \sum_{i \in J} a_i \alpha_i \in \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, we have $(\mu, \omega_{j_0}) = (\lambda, \omega_{j_0}) > 0$ by assumption, so $0 \notin \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Now say $\sum_i a_i (\lambda - \mu_i) = \sum_j b_j (\lambda - \beta_j) + c \cdot 0$

and $\sum_i a_i = \sum_j b_j + c$ for $a_i, b_j, c \in \mathbb{A}_+, \mu_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+\Delta_J, \beta_j \in \mathbb{Z}_+\Delta$. Taking the inner product with $\omega_{j_0}$,

$$D\sum_i a_i = D\sum_j b_j - \sum_j b_j(\beta_j, \omega_{j_0}) \leq D\sum_j b_j,$$

where $D = (\lambda, \omega_{j_0}) > 0$. Dividing, $\sum_i a_i \leq \sum_j b_j = \sum_i a_i - c \leq \sum_i a_i$, whence the two sums are equal and $c = 0$. Thus $\sum_j b_j\beta_j = \sum_i a_i\mu_i \in \mathbb{A}_+\Delta_J$, whence $\beta_j \in \mathbb{Z}_+\Delta_J\ \forall j$. Therefore $Y = \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is a weak $\mathbb{A}$-face of $\{0\} \cup \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, and $Y$ is a positive weak $\mathbb{A}$-face of $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ by Proposition 4.10.

Now assume that $\lambda - \alpha_i \in \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda\ \forall i$. To show the (contrapositive of the) converse, write $\lambda = \sum_{i \in I_+} c_i\alpha_i - \sum_{j \in I_-} d_j\alpha_j$, where $c_i, d_j \in \mathbb{A}_+$ and $I_\pm := \{i \in I : \pm(\lambda, \omega_i) > 0\}$. Then for $r \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\left(r + \sum_{j \in I_-} rd_j\right)\lambda + \sum_{i \in I_+} rc_i(\lambda - \alpha_i) = \sum_{i \in I_+} rc_i \cdot \lambda + \sum_{j \in I_-} rd_j(\lambda - \alpha_j).$$

The weights on the left are in $Y$, since $I_+ \subset J$. Now choose $0 < r := |a| \in \mathbb{A}$ as in the assumptions. Then the coefficients on the left side add up to $|a|(1 + \sum_{i \in I_+} c_i + \sum_{j \in I_-} d_j)$, which is larger than the sum of the right-hand coefficients. Hence $Y$ is not a positive weak $\mathbb{A}$-face of $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. $\square$

**Remark 4.14.** The above proof also shows that $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is not a positive weak $\mathbb{A}$-face of $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ if $\mathbb{Z} \cap \mathbb{A} \neq 0$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{A}\Delta_{J \setminus J_0} - \mathbb{A}_+\Delta_{I \setminus (J \cup J_0)}$, where $J_0 := \{i \in I : \lambda(h_i) = 0\}$. This is because if $i \notin J_0$, then $\lambda - \alpha_i \in \operatorname{wt} L(\lambda) \subset \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$.

## 4.3. **Connection to previous work.**

We now show how Theorems 4.4 and 4.5 provide alternate proofs of results in previous papers, and hold for all highest weight modules $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ for "generic" $\lambda$.

**Corollary 4.15.** *Fix* $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, *and an additive subgroup* $0 \neq \mathbb{A} \subset (\mathbb{R}, +)$. *Then Theorems 4.4 and 4.5 classify:*

1. *all (positive) weak* $\mathbb{A}$*-faces of* $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ *containing* $\lambda$, *if* $\lambda$ *is simply-regular.*
2. *all (positive) weak* $\mathbb{A}$*-faces of* $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, *if* $\lambda - \mathbb{Z}_+\alpha_i \subset \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ *for all* $i \in I$.
3. *all* $(\{2\}, \{1, 2\})$*-closed subsets of* $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, *if* $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = M(\lambda)$.

In this result, to classify the positive weak $\mathbb{A}$-faces, we also assume that $1 \in \mathbb{A}$.

*Proof.* If $\lambda - \alpha_i \in \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ for all $i \in I$, then every weak $\mathbb{A}$-face is of the form $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ for some $J \subset I$. Hence so is every positive weak $\mathbb{A}$-face (by the definitions, or by Proposition 4.10); therefore Theorem 4.5 classifies all the positive weak $\mathbb{A}$-faces.

Now suppose that $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ is simply-regular and $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is arbitrary. It suffices to prove that $\lambda - \alpha_i \in \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ for all $i \in I$; this holds if we show it for the irreducible quotient $L(\lambda)$ of $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Now compute:

$$x^+_{\alpha_i}(x^-_{\alpha_i}v_\lambda) = h_{\alpha_i}v_\lambda = (2(\lambda, \alpha_i)/(\alpha_i, \alpha_i))v_\lambda,$$

and this is nonzero for all $i \in I$ because $\lambda$ is simply-regular. This implies that $x^-_{\alpha_i}v_\lambda$ is nonzero in $L(\lambda)$, which proves the claim for $L(\lambda)$, and hence for $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$.

Next, assume that $\lambda$ is arbitrary and $\lambda - \mathbb{Z}_+\alpha_i \subset \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ for all $i \in I$. If $\mu := \lambda - \sum_{i \in I} n_i\alpha_i \in Y$, then $(1+|I|)\mu = \lambda + \sum_{i \in I}(\lambda - (1 + |I|)n_i\alpha_i)$. Hence $\lambda \in Y$ since $Y \subset \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is a weak $\mathbb{A}$-face. Finally, suppose $Y \subset \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda)$ is $(\{2\}, \{1, 2\})$-closed (e.g., a weak $\mathbb{A}$-face). If $y = \lambda - \sum_{i \in I} n_i\alpha_i \in Y$, then $\lambda + (\lambda - \sum_i 2n_i\alpha_i) = y + y$, so $\lambda \in Y$, as claimed. But now $Y = \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ by Theorem 4.4. $\square$

We end this section with a result pointed out to us by V. Chari. When $\lambda \in P^+$ is also simply-regular, the following result combined with Theorem 4.4 for $L(\lambda)$ (and the $W$-invariance of $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$) shows the main results in [KhRi] which classify the (positive) weak faces of $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$.

**Lemma 4.16.** *Suppose* $0 \neq \lambda \in P^+$ *and a nonempty subset* $Y \subset \operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$ *is* $(\{2\}, \{1, 2\})$*-closed in* $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$. *Then* $Y$ *contains a vertex* $w(\lambda)$ *for some* $w \in W$.

*Proof.* (By V. Chari.) Since $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$ is $W$-stable, (use Lemma 4.9 and translate $Y$;) now assume that $Y \neq \emptyset$ contains some $\mu \in P^+$. If $\mu = \lambda$, we are done; otherwise, $\mathfrak{n}^+ L(\lambda)_\mu \neq 0$, so $\mu + \alpha_i \in \operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$ for some $i \in I$. But then, so must $s_{\alpha_i}(\mu+\alpha_i) = \mu + \alpha_i - \langle \mu, \alpha_i \rangle \alpha_i - 2\alpha_i$, where $\langle \mu, \alpha_i \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Hence $\mu \pm \alpha_i \in \operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$, and since $Y$ is $(\{2\}, \{1,2\})$-closed, $\mu \pm \alpha_i \in Y$. Now $w(\mu + \alpha_i) \in P^+$ for some $w \in W$. But then $w(Y)$ has a strictly larger dominant weight: $w(\mu + \alpha_i) \geq \mu + \alpha_i > \mu$. Repeat this process in $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$; by downward induction on the height of $\lambda - \mu$, it eventually stops, and stops at $\mu = \lambda$. Thus, $\lambda \in w(Y)$ for some $w \in W$, whence $w^{-1}(\lambda) \in Y$. □

## 5. Finite maximizer subsets and generalized Verma modules

The rest of this paper is devoted to proving the main theorems stated in Section 3. In this section, we analyze in detail the weak $\mathbb{A}$-faces $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ that are finite, and thus prove Theorem 1. We first introduce an important tool needed here and below: the maps $\varpi_J$.

**Definition 5.1.** Given $J \subset I$, define $\pi_J : \mathfrak{h}^* = \mathbb{C}\Omega_I \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{C}\Omega_J$ to be the projection map with kernel $\mathbb{C}\Omega_{I \setminus J}$. Also define $\varpi_J : \lambda + \mathbb{C}\Delta_J \to \pi_J(\lambda) + \mathbb{C}\Delta_J$ (where the codomain comes from $\mathfrak{g}_J$) as follows: $\varpi_J(\lambda + \mu) := \pi_J(\lambda) + \mu$.

**Remark 5.2.** Observe that for all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and $J \subset I$, $\pi_J(\lambda) = \sum_{j \in J} \lambda(h_j)\omega_j$. Moreover, for all $\lambda$ and $J$, $\pi_J(\lambda)(h_i)$ equals $\lambda(h_i)$ or 0, depending on whether or not $i \in J$.

**Lemma 5.3.** *Suppose $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and $J \subset I$. Also fix a highest weight module $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, with highest weight vector $0 \neq v_\lambda \in \mathbb{V}^\lambda_\lambda$.*

1. *$J \subset J_\lambda$ if and only if $\pi_J(\lambda) \in P^+$ (in fact, in $P^+_J$).*
2. *Let $\mathbb{V}^\lambda_J := U(\mathfrak{g}_J)v_\lambda$. Then for all $J, J' \subset I$, $\operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda_J = \operatorname{wt}_{J \cap J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$.*
3. *$\mathbb{V}^\lambda_J$ is a highest weight $\mathfrak{g}_J$-module with highest weight $\pi_J(\lambda)$. In other words, $M_J(\pi_J(\lambda)) \twoheadrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g}_J)v_\lambda$, where $M_J$ denotes the corresponding Verma $\mathfrak{g}_J$-module.*
4. *For all $w \in W_J$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{C}\Delta_J$, $w(\varpi_J(\lambda + \mu)) = \varpi_J(w(\lambda + \mu))$.*

For all $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ and $J \subset J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$, $\varpi_J$ identifies the weights of the highest weight $\mathfrak{g}$-module $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ with those of a finite-dimensional simple $\mathfrak{g}_J$-module. More precisely, $\varpi_J : \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda \to L_J(\pi_J(\lambda))$ is a bijection.

*Proof.* (1) follows from the definitions, and (2) from the linear independence of $\Delta$ and Equation (4.13). To show (3), by Equation (2.2), it suffices to compute the action of $h_j$ for all $j \in J$ - and this was done in Remark 5.2. Finally for (4), note that the computation of $w\mu$ in either $\mathfrak{g}$ or $\mathfrak{g}_J$ yields the same answer in $\mathbb{C}\Delta_J$, since it only depends on the root (sub)system $\Phi_J$ and the corresponding Dynkin (sub)diagram. Thus, assume without loss of generality that $\mu = 0$. We then prove the result by induction on the length $\ell(w) = \ell_J(w)$ of $w \in W_J$, the base case of $\ell(w) = 0$ being obvious. Now say the statement holds for $w \in W$, and write: $w(\lambda) = \lambda - \nu$, with $\nu \in \mathbb{C}\Delta_J$. Given $j \in J$,

$$\begin{aligned}(s_j w)(\varpi_J(\lambda)) &= s_j \varpi_J(w(\lambda)) = s_j \varpi_J(\lambda - \nu) = s_j(\pi_J(\lambda) - \nu) = \pi_J(\lambda) - \pi_J(\lambda)(h_j)\alpha_j - s_j(\nu), \\ s_j(w(\lambda)) &= s_j(\lambda - \nu) = \lambda - \lambda(h_j)\alpha_j - s_j(\nu).\end{aligned}$$

But $\lambda(h_j) = \pi_J(\lambda)(h_j)$ by Remark 5.2, and as above, the computation of $s_j(\nu)$ in either setting is the same. Hence $\varpi_J(s_j(w(\lambda))) = (s_j w)(\varpi_J(\lambda))$ and the proof is complete by induction. □

### 5.1. The finite-dimensional "top" of a highest weight module.

The heart of this section is in the following result - and it immediately implies much of Theorem 1.

**Proposition 5.4.** *Fix $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, $J \subset I$, and a highest weight module $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ with highest weight vector $0 \neq v_\lambda \in \mathbb{V}^\lambda_\lambda$. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. *$J \subset J_\lambda$ and $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow M(\lambda, J) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$.*
2. *$J \subset J_\lambda$ and $\mathbb{V}^\lambda_J := U(\mathfrak{g}_J)v_\lambda \cong L_J(\pi_J(\lambda))$, the simple highest weight $\mathfrak{g}_J$-module.*
3. *$\dim U(\mathfrak{g}_J)v_\lambda < \infty$.*
4. *$\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is finite.*

*(5)* $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ *is* $W_J$*-stable.*

*Proof.* We show the following sequence of implications:

$$(1) \implies (2) \implies (3) \implies (4) \implies (3) \implies (2) \implies (1) \Longleftarrow (5) \Longleftarrow (2).$$

Suppose (1) holds, and $m_\lambda$ generates $M(\lambda, J)$. Note that showing (2) for $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = M(\lambda, J)$ shows it for all nonzero quotients $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$, since the map $: M(\lambda, J) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ restricts to a $\mathfrak{g}_J$-module surjection $: U(\mathfrak{g}_J)m_\lambda \twoheadrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g}_J)v_\lambda$. Now by Lemma 5.3, the $\mathfrak{g}_J$-submodule generated by $m_\lambda$ is a quotient of $M_J(\pi_J(\lambda))$, and $\pi_J(\lambda) \in P_J^+$. Moreover, it satisfies the corresponding defining relations in $M(\lambda, J)$. Namely, $m_\lambda$ is annihilated by $(x_{\alpha_j}^-)^{\lambda(h_j)+1}$ for all $j \in J$. But these are precisely the defining relations for a simple finite-dimensional $\mathfrak{g}_J$-module. Thus, the submodule is a nonzero quotient of the simple module $L_J(\pi_J(\lambda))$, whence it is isomorphic to $L_J(\pi_J(\lambda))$ as desired.

Next, assume (2). By Lemma 5.3, $\pi_J(\lambda) \in P_J^+$, whence $\dim L_J(\pi_J(\lambda)) < \infty$, which shows (3). By Equation (4.13), (3) $\iff$ (4), using that every weight space of a highest weight $\mathfrak{g}_J$-module is finite-dimensional. We now show that (3) $\implies$ (2). Given (3), $U(\mathfrak{g}_J)v_\lambda$ is a finite-dimensional highest weight $\mathfrak{g}_J$-module with highest weight $\pi_J(\lambda)$, by Lemma 5.3. By the theory of the Bernstein-Gelfand-Gelfand (BGG) Category $\mathcal{O}$ [Hu], it is necessarily simple, since there is at most one dominant integral weight in any central character block/twisted Weyl group orbit.

Now assume (2). It is clear that for all $J \subset J_\lambda$, the highest weight vector in $L_J(\pi_J(\lambda))$ is killed by $(x_{\alpha_j}^-)^{\pi_J(\lambda)(h_j)+1}$ for all $j \in J$. By Remark 5.2, $M(\lambda, J)$ surjects onto $L_J(\pi_J(\lambda))$, proving (1). To show that (2) $\implies$ (5), use a part of Lemma 5.3; thus, given $\lambda - \mu \in \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ and $w \in W_J$,

$$\varpi_J(w(\lambda - \mu)) = w(\varpi_J(\lambda - \mu)) = w(\pi_J(\lambda) - \mu) \in w(\operatorname{wt} L_J(\pi_J(\lambda))) = \operatorname{wt} L_J(\pi_J(\lambda)) = \varpi_J(\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda).$$

Note that the sets $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda \subset \lambda - \mathbb{Z}_+\Delta_J$ and $\operatorname{wt} L_J(\pi_J(\lambda)) \subset \pi_J(\lambda) - \mathbb{Z}_+\Delta_J$ are in bijection by Lemma 5.3, via the map $\varpi_J$. Now $\operatorname{wt} L_J(\pi_J(\lambda))$ is $W_J$-stable (by standard Lie theory for $\mathfrak{g}_J$). Hence so is $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, again using Lemma 5.3 and the above computation. This proves (5).

Conversely, assume (5). We first claim that $J \subset J_\lambda$. To see this, note that $s_j(\lambda) \in \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ by (5). Hence $\mathbb{Z}_+\Delta_J$ contains $\lambda - s_j(\lambda) = \lambda(h_j)\alpha_j$ for all $j \in J$, which shows the claim. Next, to show that $M(\lambda, J) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, it suffices to show that $(x_{\alpha_j}^-)^{\lambda(h_j)+1}v_\lambda = 0$ for all $j \in J$. Suppose this fails to hold for some $j \in J$. Then by $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-theory, $\lambda - (\lambda(h_j) + 1)\alpha_j \in \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, and hence it is in $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Since this is $W_J$-stable by (5), $s_j(\lambda - (\lambda(h_j) + 1)\alpha_j) = \lambda + \alpha_j \in \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. This is a contradiction. $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Given $\lambda$ and $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$, define $J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda) := \{j \in J_\lambda : (x_{\alpha_j}^-)^{\lambda(h_j)+1}v_\lambda = 0\} \subset J_\lambda$. We first show that the conditions in Proposition 5.4 are all equivalent to: $J \subset J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$. By definition, $M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, so for all $J \subset J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$, $M(\lambda, J) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Hence $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is finite by Proposition 5.4. Conversely, by that same result, if $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is finite for any $J$, then $J \subset J_\lambda$ and $M(\lambda, J) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, so $(x_{\alpha_j}^-)^{\lambda(h_j)+1}v_\lambda = 0 \ \forall j \in J$. Now $J \subset J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$ as claimed.

For the equivalences, it remains to show that $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is $W_J$-stable if and only if $J \subset J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$. Fix the parabolic Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$. Then [Hu, Lemma 9.3, Proposition 9.3, and Theorem 9.4] imply that $M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)) \in \mathcal{O}^\mathfrak{p}$, so $\mathbb{V}^\lambda \in \mathcal{O}$ lies in $\mathcal{O}^\mathfrak{p}$ as well, and $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is stable under $W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$. Now if $i \notin J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$, then since $\mathbb{V}^\lambda_{\lambda - n\alpha_i} = \mathbb{C} \cdot (x_{\alpha_i}^-)^n v_\lambda$ for all $n \geq 0$, it follows that $s_i$ does not preserve the root string $\lambda - \mathbb{Z}_+\alpha_i = (\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda) \cap (\lambda - \mathbb{Z}\alpha_i)$. Hence $s_i$ does not preserve $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$.

Finally, if $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = M(\lambda, J')$ for $J' \subset J_\lambda$ and $i \notin J'$, then $\lambda - \mathbb{Z}_+\alpha_i \subset \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ by [KhRi, Proposition 2.3]. By the above analysis, $J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda) \subset J'$. Since $U(\mathfrak{g}_{J'})m_\lambda \subset \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is finite-dimensional, hence $J' = J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$. Now recall that for all $i \in I$ and $n \geq 0$, the Kostant partition function yields: $\dim M(\lambda)_{\lambda - n\alpha_i} = 1$. If $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = L(\lambda)$ is simple and $j \in J_\lambda$, then $(x_{\alpha_j}^-)^{\lambda(h_j)+1}m_\lambda \in M(\lambda)$ is a maximal vector in $M(\lambda)$, whence $\operatorname{wt}_{\{j\}} L(\lambda)$ is finite if $j \in J_\lambda$. It is also easy to see by highest weight $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-theory that $\operatorname{wt}_{\{j\}} L(\lambda) = \lambda - \mathbb{Z}_+\alpha_j$ if $j \notin J_\lambda$. Hence $J(L(\lambda)) = J_\lambda$ from above. $\square$

5.2. **Characterizing finite weak faces.** We conclude this section by characterizing all finite weak faces of highest weight modules $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$, of the form $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. To state the result, we need some notation.

**Definition 5.5.** Recall that the *support* of a weight $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ is $\operatorname{supp}(\lambda) := \{i \in I : (\lambda, \alpha_i) \neq 0\}$.

1. Given $J \subset I$, define $C(\lambda, J) \subset J$ to be the set of nodes in the connected graph components of the Dynkin (sub)diagram of $J \subset I$, which are not disjoint from $\operatorname{supp}(\lambda)$.
2. Given $X \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$, define $\chi_X$ to be the indicator function of $X$, i.e., $\chi_X(x) := 1_{x \in X}$.
3. Given a finite subset $X \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$, define $\rho_X := \sum_{x \in X} x = \vec{\ell}(\chi_X)$.

It was shown in [CDR] that $S \subset \operatorname{wt} \mathfrak{g}$ is a weak $\mathbb{Z}$-face of $\operatorname{wt} L(\theta)$ if and only if $S = (\operatorname{wt} \mathfrak{g})(\rho_S)$. Thus, a natural question is if similar "intrinsic" characterizations exist for general highest weight modules. It turns out that finite weak $\mathbb{Z}$-faces $S \subset \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ are indeed characterized by $\rho_S = \sum_{y \in S} y$ for all $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Additionally, they are also uniquely determined by $\ell(S)$ and $\vec{\ell}(S)$:

**Theorem 5.6.** *Given $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, fix $w \in W$ that preserves $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Given $J \subset J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$ and a finite subset $S \subset \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, $S = w(\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda)$ if and only if $\ell(\chi_S) = \ell(\chi_{w(\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda)})$ and $\vec{\ell}(\chi_S) = \vec{\ell}(\chi_{w(\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda)})$. Moreover,*

$$\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda = (\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda)(\rho_{I \setminus J}) = (\operatorname{wt}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda)(\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \rho_{\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda}). \tag{5.7}$$

For a result that computes the maximizer sets of a larger family of weights, see Corollary 5.13.

In order to prove Theorem 5.6, we collect together some results from [KhRi].

**Theorem 5.8** ([KhRi])**.** *Fix $0 \neq \lambda \in P^+$ and a subfield $\mathbb{F} \subset \mathbb{R}$. The following are equivalent for a nonempty proper subset $Y \subsetneq \operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$:*

1. *There exist $w \in W$ and $C(\lambda, I) \not\subset J$ such that $wY = \operatorname{wt}_J L(\lambda)$.*
2. *$Y$ is a positive weak $\mathbb{F}$-face of $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$.*
3. *$Y$ is a weak $\mathbb{F}$-face of $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$.*
4. *$Y$ is the maximizer in $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$ of the linear functional $(\rho_Y, -)$, where $\rho_Y := \sum_{y \in Y} y$. The maximum value is $(\rho_Y, \rho_Y)/|Y| > 0$.*
5. *$Y$ is the maximizer in $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$ of some nonzero linear functional - i.e., the set of weights on some proper face of $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}}(\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda))$.*

*Moreover, for all $J \subset I$, $\rho_{\operatorname{wt}_J L(\lambda)} \in P^+$.*

More generally, one can consider (positive) weak $\mathbb{A}$-faces for any additive subgroup $0 \neq \mathbb{A} \subset (\mathbb{R}, +)$. It is not hard to show that these are also equivalent to the notions in Theorem 5.8:

**Corollary 5.9.** *Setting as in Theorem 5.8. Also fix a subgroup $0 \neq \mathbb{A} \subset (\mathbb{R}, +)$. Then $Y \subsetneq \operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$ is a weak $\mathbb{F}$-face of $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$ if and only if $Y \subsetneq \operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$ is a (positive) weak $\mathbb{A}$-face.*

*Proof.* If $Y$ is a weak $\mathbb{F}$-face, then by Theorem 5.8, $Y = (\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda))(\rho_Y)$ and $\rho_Y(Y) > 0$. Hence $Y$ is a positive weak $\mathbb{A}$-face of $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$ by Lemma 4.9, hence a weak $\mathbb{A}$-face by Proposition 4.10. Now suppose $Y$ is a weak $\mathbb{A}$-face of $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$. Choosing $0 < a \in \mathbb{A}$, it is easy to see by Lemmas 2.19 and 4.9 that $Y \subset \operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$ is a weak $a\mathbb{Z}$-face, hence a weak $\mathbb{Z}$-face and a weak $\mathbb{Q}$-face as well. Now by Theorem 5.8, $Y = (\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda))(\varphi)$ for some $\varphi$, and hence also a weak $\mathbb{F}$-face of $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$. □

To prove Theorem 5.6, we need one last proposition, which will also be used to prove Theorem 4.

**Proposition 5.10.** *Fix $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, and $J \subset J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$.*

1. *Then $\rho_{\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda}$ is $W_J$-invariant, and in $P^+_{J_\lambda \setminus J} \times \mathbb{C}\Omega_{I \setminus J_\lambda}$.*
2. *Define $\rho_{I \setminus J} := \sum_{i \notin J} \omega_i$. Then (notation as in Lemma 2.19 and Remark 5.2) for all $J' \subset J_\lambda$:*

$$\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda = (\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda)(\rho_{I \setminus J}) = (\operatorname{wt}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda)(\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \rho_{\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda}) \subset (\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda)(\pi_{J'} \rho_{\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda}) \tag{5.11}$$

*and $0 \leq (\pi_{J'} \rho_{\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda})(\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda) \in \mathbb{Z}_+$.*

As a consequence of the first part, $(\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda}, \alpha_j) = 0$ for all $j \in J$, if $\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is finite.

*Proof.*

(1) By Proposition 5.4, $\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ and hence $\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda}$ is $W_J$-stable. Thus it is fixed by each $s_j$ for $j \in J$, so $(\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda}, \alpha_j) = 0\ \forall j \in J$. Next, $\lambda(h_j), -\alpha_{j'}(h_j) \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ for $j \in J_\lambda$ and $j' \neq j$ in $I$. Hence for each $\mu \in \mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda \subset \lambda - \mathbb{Z}_+\Delta_J$, $\mu(h_j) \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ if $j \in J_\lambda \setminus J$. Thus, $\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda}(h_j) \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ as well, so $\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda} \in P^+_{J_\lambda \setminus J} \times \mathbb{C}\Omega_{I \setminus J_\lambda}$.

(2) The first equality is from Theorem 4.4. Now given $J' \subset J_\lambda$, $\pi_{J'}\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda} \in P^+_{J' \setminus J} \subset P^+_{J_\lambda}$ by the previous part. Hence by definition of $J_\lambda$, $(\pi_{J'}\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda}, \lambda) \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and by the previous sentence, $(\pi_{J'}\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda}, \alpha_j) = 0\ \forall j \in J$. Thus the linear functional $(\pi_{J'}\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda}, -)$ is constant on $\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, and the value is in $\mathbb{Z}_+$. Moreover, given any $\alpha \in \Delta$, $(\pi_{J'}\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda}, \alpha) \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, so the linear functional can never attain strictly larger values than at $\lambda$. This proves the inclusion.

Now $\pi_{J'}\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda} \in P^+_{J_\lambda} = \mathbb{Z}_+\Omega_{J_\lambda}$, so $(\pi_{J'}\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda}, \lambda) \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ by the definition of $J_\lambda$. The inclusion now implies the inequality. To show the second equality, note by Proposition 5.4 that $\mathbb{V}^\lambda_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \cong M := L_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda))$ as $\mathfrak{g}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$-modules. Thus $M$ is a finite-dimensional simple $\mathfrak{g}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$-module, and the bijection $\varpi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} : \mathrm{wt}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda \to \mathrm{wt}\, M$ (from Proposition 5.4) sends $\lambda - \nu \in \mathrm{wt}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ to $\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda) - \nu \in \mathrm{wt}\, M$. Moreover, for all $j \in J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$, the two weights agree at $h_j$. Now for all $j \in J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$, Remark 5.2 implies that

$$\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda})(h_j) = \rho_{\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda}(h_j) = \sum_{\mu \in \mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda} \mu(h_j) = \sum_{\mu \in \mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda} \varpi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\mu)(h_j) = \rho_{\mathrm{wt}_J M}(h_j). \tag{5.12}$$

Hence $\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda}) = \rho_{\mathrm{wt}_J M}$ as elements of $P^+_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda) \setminus J} \subset P^+_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$. Now the inclusion shown earlier in this part, for $J' = J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$, proves that $\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda \subset T := (\mathrm{wt}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda)(\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda})$. Conversely, suppose $\lambda - \nu \in T$, with $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}_+\Delta_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$. Then $(\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda}, \nu) = 0$ since $\lambda \in T$, so $(\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_J M}, \nu) = 0$ by Equation (5.12). Moreover, $\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda) - \nu \in \mathrm{wt}\, M$ (via the bijection $\varpi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$). Therefore $\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda) - \nu \in (\mathrm{wt}\, M)(\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_J M}) = \mathrm{wt}_J M$ (by Theorem 5.8 for $\mathfrak{g}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$). This implies that $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}_+\Delta_J$, whence $\lambda - \nu \in \mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ as required.

□

*Proof of Theorem 5.6.* The last equation was shown in Proposition 5.10 and Theorem 4.4 (this latter holds for all $J \subset I$). For the first equivalence, one implication is obvious. For the converse, $\lambda - \mu \in \mathbb{Z}_+\Delta\ \forall \mu \in \mathrm{wt}\, \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, whence $(\rho_{I \setminus J}, \lambda - \mu) \geq 0$. Equality is attained if and only if $\lambda - \mu \in \mathbb{Z}_+\Delta_J$ (i.e., $\mu \in \mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$). Thus given any finite subset $S \subset \mathrm{wt}\, \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, compute using the assumptions:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \quad &\leq \quad \sum_{\mu \in S} (\rho_{I \setminus J}, \lambda - w^{-1}(\mu)) = \left( \rho_{I \setminus J}, \sum_{\mu \in S} (\lambda - w^{-1}(\mu)) \right) = (\rho_{I \setminus J}, \ell(\chi_S)\lambda - w^{-1}(\vec{\ell}(\chi_S))) \\
&= \quad (\rho_{I \setminus J}, \ell(\chi_{w(\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda)})\lambda - w^{-1}(\vec{\ell}(\chi_{w(\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda)}))) = (\rho_{I \setminus J}, \ell(\chi_{\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda})\lambda - \vec{\ell}(\chi_{\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda})) \\
&= \quad \sum_{\mu \in \mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda} (\rho_{I \setminus J}, \lambda - \mu) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the inequality is actually an equality, which means that $w^{-1}(S) \subset \mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ by the above analysis. Since $|w^{-1}(S)| = \ell(\chi_S) = \ell(\chi_{\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda}) = |\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda|$, hence $w^{-1}(S) = \mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. □

The following consequences of the above analysis will be used later, to show Theorems 3 and 4.

**Corollary 5.13.** *Given $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, and subsets $J_1, J_2, J_3 \subset I$, one has:*

$$(\mathrm{wt}_{J_1} \mathbb{V}^\lambda)(\rho_{J_2} + \pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_{J_3 \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda})) = \mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda, \tag{5.14}$$

*where* $J = J_1 \cap (I \setminus J_2) \cap [(I \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)) \coprod (J_3 \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda))]$. *Moreover, given* $k > 0$ *and* $J'_r, J''_s \subset I$,

$$\bigcap_{r=1}^{k} \operatorname{wt}_{J'_r} \mathbb{V}^\lambda \cap \bigcap_s \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}}(\operatorname{wt}_{J''_s} \mathbb{V}^\lambda) = \operatorname{wt}_{\cap_r J'_r \cap_s J''_s} \mathbb{V}^\lambda. \tag{5.15}$$

*Proof.* By Proposition 5.10 and Theorem 5.6, $(\alpha_i, \pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\rho_{\operatorname{wt}_{J_3 \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda}))$ is zero if $i \in J_3 \cup (I \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda))$, and positive for all other $i \in I$. It follows that $\lambda$ is contained in both sides of Equation (5.14), and the rest of this equation is also not hard to show. The proof of Equation (5.15) is straightforward. $\square$

## 6. Application 1: Weights of simple highest weight modules

We now apply the above results and techniques to show one of the main applications in this paper: namely, to compute the weights of simple modules $L(\lambda)$ (as in Theorem 5). We then discuss the more involved question of computing the weight multiplicities in $L(\lambda)$ - see Theorem 6.5.

*Proof of Theorem 5.* Note that if $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = M(\lambda, J')$, then the first and third expressions in Equation (3.9) are equal by [Hu, §9.4]. We now show a cyclic chain of inclusions:

$$\operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J') \subset (\lambda - \mathbb{Z}\Delta) \cap \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J') \subset \coprod_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \Delta_{I \setminus J'}} \operatorname{wt} L_{J'}(\lambda - \mu) \subset \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J').$$

The first inclusion is obvious since $\operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J')$ is contained in each factor. Also note that the last expression in Equation (3.9) is indeed a disjoint union since $\Delta$ is a basis of $\mathfrak{h}^*$. Now to show the third inclusion, first note that $\lambda - \mu \in P^+_{J'} \cap \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J')$ for all $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \Delta_{I \setminus J'}$. Moreover, if $0 \neq m_{\lambda - \mu} \in M(\lambda, J')_{\lambda - \mu}$, then it is easy to verify that $m_{\lambda-\mu}$ is killed by all $x^+_{\alpha_j}$ for $j \in J'$. Hence

$$\operatorname{wt} L_{J'}(\lambda - \mu) = \operatorname{wt} U(\mathfrak{g}_{J'}) m_{\lambda - \mu} \subset \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J') \quad \forall \mu \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \Delta_{I \setminus J'},$$

and the third inclusion follows. Next, we show the second inclusion. Since $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J') \subset \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda) = \lambda - \mathbb{R}_+ \Delta$, it suffices to show that

$$(\lambda - \mathbb{Z}\Delta) \cap \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J') = (\lambda - \mathbb{Z}_+\Delta) \cap \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J') \subset \coprod_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \Delta_{I \setminus J'}} \operatorname{wt} L_{J'}(\lambda - \mu). \tag{6.1}$$

Now suppose $\lambda - \nu$ is in (the intersection on) the left-hand side of Equation (6.1), where $\nu = \sum_{i \in I} n_i \alpha_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \Delta$. Since both sides of Equation (6.1) are $W_{J'}$-stable, there exists $w \in W_{J'}$ such that $w(\lambda - \nu) \in P^+_{J'} \times \mathbb{R}\Omega_{I \setminus J'}$. Now set $\mu := \sum_{i \notin J'} n_i \alpha_i$; then by the $W_{J'}$-invariance of the left side,

$$w(\lambda - \nu) \in (\lambda - \mu) - Q^+_{J'} = (\lambda - \mu) - \mathbb{Z}_+ \Delta_{J'},$$

and both of these are weights in $P^+_{J'} \times \mathbb{R}\Omega_{I \setminus J'}$. Hence by Theorem 2.3,

$$\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} W_{J'}(\lambda - \nu) \subset \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} W_{J'}(\lambda - \mu) = \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} L_{J'}(\lambda - \mu).$$

Consequently, using Theorem 2.3,

$$w(\lambda - \nu) \in (\lambda - \mu - Q^+_{J'}) \cap \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} W_{J'}(\lambda - \nu) \subset (\lambda - \mu - Q^+_{J'}) \cap \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} L_{J'}(\lambda - \mu) = \operatorname{wt} L_{J'}(\lambda - \mu).$$

Thus $\lambda - \nu \in \operatorname{wt} L_{J'}(\lambda - \mu)$, which shows Equation (6.1). Equation (3.9) now follows for $M(\lambda, J')$.

Next, given a general highest weight module $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$, Theorem 1 and Proposition 5.4 show that $M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, whence $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda \subset \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda))$. Now **claim** that $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda))$. To see this, note that $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is $\mathfrak{g}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$-integrable by results in [Hu] (as discussed in the proof of Theorem 1). Hence by Equation (3.9) for $M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda))$ (and the proof of the third inclusion above), it suffices to show that $\lambda - \mathbb{Z}_+ \Delta_{I \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \subset \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ if $|J_\lambda \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)| \leq 1$. Thus, suppose $J_\lambda \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda) \subset \{i_0\}$ for some $i_0 \in I$. We now obtain a contradiction by assuming that there exists $\mu = \sum_{i \notin J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} n_i \alpha_i \in$

$\mathbb{Z}_+\Delta_{I\setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$ such that $\lambda-\mu\notin \operatorname{wt}\mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Indeed, choose such a weight $\mu$ of minimal height $\sum_{i\notin J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} n_i$. Then $\mathbb{V}^\lambda_{\lambda-\mu}=0$, so if $v_\lambda$ spans $\mathbb{V}^\lambda_\lambda$, then the following vector is zero in $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$:

$$v_{\lambda-\mu} := (x^-_{\alpha_{i_0}})^{\mathbf{1}(i_0\notin J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda))\cdot n_{i_0}} \cdot \prod_{i\notin J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)\cup\{i_0\}} (x^-_{\alpha_i})^{n_i}\cdot v_\lambda$$

under some enumeration of $I\setminus(J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)\cup\{i_0\})=\{i_1,\dots,i_m\}$. But then applying powers of $x^+_{\alpha_{i_j}}$ for $1\leq j\leq m$ still yields zero. Now compute inductively, using $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-theory and the Serre relations:

$$\begin{aligned}0=\prod_{j=1}^m (x^+_{\alpha_{i_j}})^{n_{i_j}}\cdot v_{\lambda-\mu} &= (x^-_{\alpha_{i_0}})^{\mathbf{1}(i_0\notin J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda))\cdot n_{i_0}}\cdot \prod_{j=1}^m n_{i_j}! \prod_{k=1}^{n_{i_j}} (\lambda(h_{i_j})-k+1)\cdot v_\lambda\\ &\in \mathbb{C}^\times (x^-_{\alpha_{i_0}})^{\mathbf{1}(i_0\notin J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda))\cdot n_{i_0}}\cdot v_\lambda.\end{aligned}$$

However, if $i_0\notin J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$, then (using the Kostant partition function,) $\lambda-\mathbb{Z}_+\alpha_{i_0}\subset\operatorname{wt}\mathbb{V}^\lambda$. This yields a contradiction, so no such $\mu$ exists and the claim is proved. Equation (3.9) now follows easily for $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$. □

Given Theorem 5, it is natural to ask if Equation (3.9) holds more generally for other highest weight modules $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$. We now show that this is false.

**Theorem 6.2.** *Fix $\lambda\in\mathfrak{h}^*$, $M(\lambda)\twoheadrightarrow\mathbb{V}^\lambda$, and $J'\subset J_\lambda$. If $|J_\lambda\setminus J'|\leq 1$, then*

$$J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)=J' \qquad\Longrightarrow\qquad \operatorname{wt}\mathbb{V}^\lambda=(\lambda-\mathbb{Z}\Delta)\cap\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}}\operatorname{wt}\mathbb{V}^\lambda. \tag{6.3}$$

*Equation* (6.3) *however need not always hold if $|J_\lambda\setminus J'|=2$; and if $|J_\lambda\setminus J'|\geq 3$, then Equation* (6.3) *always fails to hold for some $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ with $J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)=J'$.*

**Remark 6.4.** Thus, the formula for $\operatorname{wt}\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is not as "clean" as the formula for its convex hull. For instance, if $\lambda$ is simply-regular, then the convex hull of $\operatorname{wt}\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ was computed in Theorem 2 (and depends only on $J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$). On the other hand, the set $\operatorname{wt}\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ need not satisfy Equation (6.3). By Equation (3.9), $\operatorname{wt}\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ therefore does not always equal $\coprod_{\mu\in\mathbb{Z}_+\Delta_{I\setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}}\operatorname{wt}L_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda-\mu)$ either.

Moreover, an obvious consequence of Theorem 6.2 is that the convex hull $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}}\operatorname{wt}\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ does not uniquely determine the module $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ (or even its set of weights).

*Proof of Theorem 6.2.* Equation (6.3) follows from Theorem 5. We now claim that if $s_is_j=s_js_i\in W$ for some simple reflections corresponding to $i\neq j\in J_\lambda\setminus J'$, then Equation (6.3) fails for some $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ with $J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)=J'$. This shows the remaining assertions in the theorem, since no Dynkin diagram of finite type contains a 3-cycle (with possible multi-edges).

To show the claim, note that $\mathfrak{g}_{\{i,j\}}$ is of type $A_1\times A_1$. Hence the vector

$$v:=(x^-_{\alpha_i})^{\lambda(h_i)+1}(x^-_{\alpha_j})^{\lambda(h_j)+1}m_\lambda\in M(\lambda)$$

is maximal by $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-theory and the Serre relations. Moreover, $v$ has $\mathfrak{h}$-weight $s_is_j\bullet\lambda=s_is_j(\lambda+\rho)-\rho$. Now note by the Kostant partition function for $A_1\times A_1$ that

$$\dim M(\lambda)_\mu=\dim M_{\{i,j\}}(\lambda)_\mu=1, \qquad \forall\mu\in\lambda-\mathbb{Z}_+\Delta_{\{i,j\}}.$$

Hence $s_is_j\bullet\lambda\notin\operatorname{wt}\mathbb{V}^\lambda$, where $\mathbb{V}^\lambda=M(\lambda)/U(\mathfrak{g})v$. On the other hand, it is clear by inspection that $\lambda-\mathbb{Z}_+\Delta\subset\operatorname{wt}(M(\lambda)/U(\mathfrak{g})v)$, so Equation (6.3) fails to hold for $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$. □

**Weyl Character Formula and simple modules.** Note by Theorem 2 that $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} L(\lambda) = \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J_\lambda)$ for all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. A stronger result was Theorem 5, which showed that $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda) = \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J_\lambda)$ for all $\lambda$. The even stronger assertion - namely, $L(\lambda) = M(\lambda, J_\lambda)$ - has also been studied in detail in the literature, by Wallach, Conze-Berline and Duflo, and Jantzen among others. However, this assertion was not shown for all $\lambda$; see [Hu, Chapter 9] for more details. The approach in [Hu] starts with a parabolic subgroup of $W$ and then works with suitable highest weights $\lambda$, while in this paper the approach is reversed, to start with a highest weight $\lambda$. Thus for completeness, we quickly discuss a sufficient condition which is slightly different from the one in *loc. cit.*

**Theorem 6.5** (Weyl Character Formula)**.** *Suppose the set $S_\lambda := \{w \bullet \lambda \ : \ w \in W, w \bullet \lambda \leq \lambda\}$ equals $W_{J_\lambda}$. Then $L(\lambda)$ is the unique quotient of $M(\lambda)$ whose set of weights is $W_{J_\lambda}$-invariant, whence*

$$\operatorname{ch} L(\lambda) = \operatorname{ch} M(\lambda, J_\lambda) = \frac{\sum_{w \in W_{J_\lambda}} (-1)^{\ell(w)} e^{w(\lambda + \rho_I)}}{\sum_{w \in W} (-1)^{\ell(w)} e^{w(\rho_I)}}. \tag{6.6}$$

Note that this result unifies the cases of dominant integral or antidominant $\lambda$ (where $S_\lambda = W$ and $J_\lambda = I$, or $S_\lambda = \{1\}$ and $J_\lambda = \emptyset$ respectively). Equation (6.6) thus generalizes the usual Weyl character formula for finite-dimensional simple modules.

*Proof.* If $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is $W_{J_\lambda}$-invariant, then $\operatorname{wt}_{\{j\}} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is $s_j$-invariant for all $j \in J_\lambda$. Thus $(x_{\alpha_j}^-)^{\lambda(h_j)+1} v_\lambda = 0$ for all $j \in J_\lambda$ (where $v_\lambda$ spans $\mathbb{V}^\lambda_\lambda$), whence $M(\lambda, J_\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Now recall that the sets $[L(w \bullet \lambda)]$ and $[M(w \bullet \lambda)]$ (running over $w \in W$) are $\mathbb{Z}$-bases of the Grothendieck group of the block $\mathcal{O}(\lambda)$, with unipotent (triangular) change-of-basis matrices with respect to the usual partial order on $\mathfrak{h}^*$. Thus, $\operatorname{ch} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-linear combination of $\operatorname{ch} M(\mu)$, with $\mu \in S_\lambda$.

Next, note that $W_{J_\lambda} \subset S_\lambda$ for all $\lambda$. Now proceed as in proof of the Weyl character formula: if $q := \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+} (e^{\alpha/2} - e^{-\alpha/2})$ is the usual Weyl denominator, then using that $\dim \mathbb{V}^\lambda_\lambda = 1$, we get:

$$q * \operatorname{ch} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \sum_{w \in W_{J_\lambda}} c_w q * \operatorname{ch} M(w \bullet \lambda) = \sum_{w \in W_{J_\lambda}} c_w e^{w(\lambda + \rho_I)}, \qquad c_1 = 1.$$

Now the left side is $W_{J_\lambda}$-alternating, whence so is the right side. This shows that $c_w = (-1)^{\ell(w)}$, and therefore that $\operatorname{ch} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is independent of $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ itself. Since $M(\lambda, J_\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda \twoheadrightarrow L(\lambda)$, they must all be equal. Equation (6.6) now follows from the well-known expansion of the Weyl denominator. $\square$

## 7. Inclusion relations among maximizer subsets

We now analyze when two maximizer subsets of $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ are equal. More precisely, when is $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ for $J, J' \subset I$? The following special case has been shown in the literature.

**Theorem 7.1** (Khare and Ridenour, [KhRi, Theorem 4])**.** *Suppose $\lambda \in P^+$ and $J, J' \subset I = J(L(\lambda))$. The vertices of $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt}_J L(\lambda)$ are precisely $W_J(\lambda)$. Moreover, $\operatorname{wt}_J L(\lambda) = \operatorname{wt}_{J'} L(\lambda)$ if and only if $\rho_{\operatorname{wt}_J L(\lambda)} = \rho_{\operatorname{wt}_{J'} L(\lambda)}$, if and only if $W_J(\lambda) = W_{J'}(\lambda)$.*

We now extend this result as well as a result in [Vi] from finite-dimensional $L(\lambda)$ to arbitrary $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$.

**Proposition 7.2.** *Fix $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, and $J, J' \subset J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$. Then the vertices of $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}}(\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda)$ are precisely $W_J(\lambda)$. Moreover, the following are equivalent:*

1. $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$.
2. $\rho_{\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda} = \rho_{\operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda}$.
3. $\rho_{\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda} \in \mathbb{Q}_+ \rho_{\operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda}$.
4. $\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\rho_{\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda}) = \pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\rho_{\operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda})$.
5. $\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\rho_{\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda}) \in \mathbb{Q}_+ \pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\rho_{\operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda})$.
6. $W_J(\lambda) = W_{J'}(\lambda)$.
7. $\rho_{\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda}, \rho_{\operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda}$ *are both fixed by* $W_{J \cup J'}$.

This is an "intermediate" result since $J, J' \subset J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$. The case of general $J, J' \subset I$ is Theorem 4.

*Proof.* The fact about the vertices comes from Theorem 7.1 (for $\mathfrak{g}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$) and Lemma 5.3, via the bijection $\varpi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$ - since $W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda) \subset \lambda - \mathbb{Z}_+\Delta$, and similarly for $W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda))$. Next, $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ and $\operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ are both finite sets by Theorem 1. The following implications are now obvious:

$$(1) \implies (2) \implies (3) \implies (5); \qquad (2) \implies (4) \implies (5).$$

Now if (5) holds, then the two (equal) weights have the same maximizer by Proposition 5.10:

$$\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda = (\operatorname{wt}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda)(\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \rho_{\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda}) = (\operatorname{wt}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda)(\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \rho_{\operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda}) = \operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda.$$

This proves (1) again. Now if $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, then their convex hulls (which are polytopes) are equal. Via $\varpi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$, this also means that the convex hulls of certain subsets of weights of $M := L_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda))$, a finite-dimensional $\mathfrak{g}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$-module, are equal. Hence the sets of vertices are the same, so by Theorem 7.1, $W_J(\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda)) = W_{J'}(\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda))$ in $\operatorname{wt} M$. But then the same holds in $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ via $\varpi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$ (using Lemma 5.3).

Conversely, assume (6); again use Lemma 5.3 and work inside $M = L_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda))$ (via $\varpi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$). Theorem 7.1 for $\mathfrak{g}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$ shows that $\operatorname{wt}_J M = \operatorname{wt}_{J'} M$, so $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ via $\varpi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$. Finally, (7) $\implies$ (1) using Lemma 7.4 (below), and conversely, $X := \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is stable under both $W_J$ and $W_{J'}$ by Theorem 1. Hence so is $\rho_X$, which shows (7). ☐

In the previous proof, as well as to show Theorem 4, some preliminary results are used.

**Lemma 7.3.** *Fix $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, and $I_0 \subset I$ such that $\mathbb{V}^\lambda_{I_0} := U(\mathfrak{g}_{I_0})v_\lambda$ is a simple $\mathfrak{g}_{I_0}$-module. Then the following are equivalent for $J \subset I_0$:*

1. $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda_{I_0} = \operatorname{wt}_\emptyset \mathbb{V}^\lambda_{I_0} = \{\lambda\}$.
2. $\lambda - \alpha_j \notin \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda_{I_0}\ \forall j \in J$.
3. $x_j^- v_\lambda = 0\ \forall j \in J$.
4. $x_j^- v_\lambda \in \ker \mathfrak{n}^+\ \forall j \in J$.
5. $J \subset I \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\lambda)$, *i.e.*, $(\lambda, \alpha_j) = 0\ \forall j \in J$.

*Moreover, if $J \cap \operatorname{supp}(\lambda) \neq J' \cap \operatorname{supp}(\lambda)$ (for $J, J' \subset I_0$), then $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda \neq \operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. In particular, the assignment $: J \mapsto \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is one-to-one on the power set of $I_0 \cap \operatorname{supp}(\lambda)$.*

A special case is $\mathbb{V}^\lambda_{I_0} = L(\lambda)$ (for any $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$), when $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = L(\lambda)$ and $I_0 = I$.

*Proof.* That (1) $\implies$ (2) $\implies$ (3) $\implies$ (4) is clear. Next, given (4), $0 = x^+_{\alpha_j} x^-_{\alpha_j} v_\lambda = \lambda(h_j) v_\lambda$, whence $\lambda(h_j) = 0$. Thus $(\lambda, \alpha_j) = 0\ \forall j \in J$, whence $J \subset I \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\lambda)$.

We now show all the contrapositives. Suppose $\lambda > \mu = \lambda - \sum_{j \in J} a_j \alpha_j \in \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda_{I_0} = \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ (by Lemma 5.3). By Lemma 4.12, there exists a sequence $\lambda = \mu_0 > \mu_1 > \cdots > \mu_N = \mu$ in $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, such that $\mu_j - \mu_{j+1} \in \Delta_J\ \forall j$. Thus, $\mu_1 = \lambda - \alpha_j \in \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ for some $j \in J$, which contradicts (2). In turn, this implies: $x^-_{\alpha_j} v_\lambda \neq 0$ (notation as in Lemma 4.12), which contradicts (3). If (3) fails, then $x^-_{\alpha_j} v_\lambda$ is not a maximal vector (i.e., not in $\ker \mathfrak{n}^+$), since $\mathbb{V}^\lambda_{I_0}$ is simple. If (4) is false, then by the Serre relations, $0 \neq x^+_{\alpha_j} x^-_{\alpha_j} v_\lambda = \lambda(h_j) v_\lambda$. Hence $(\lambda, \alpha_j) \neq 0$, i.e., $j \in \operatorname{supp}(\lambda)$. This contradicts (5).

Finally, given $J, J' \subset I_0$ as above, choose $j \in J \cap \operatorname{supp}(\lambda) \setminus J'$. By the above equivalences (in which $J = \{j\}$), $\lambda - \alpha_j \in \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda_{I_0}$. Hence $\lambda - \alpha_j \in \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda_{I_0} \setminus \operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda_{I_0}$, whence $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda_{I_0} \neq \operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda_{I_0}$. By Lemma 5.3, $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda \neq \operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ (since $J, J' \subset I_0$). ☐

**Lemma 7.4.** *(Setup as in Proposition 7.2.) If $W_{J \cup J'}$ fixes $\rho_{\operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda}$, then $\operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \operatorname{wt}_{J \cup J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$.*

*Proof.* Suppose the conclusion fails, i.e., $\mu = \lambda - \sum_{j \in J'} a_j \alpha_j - \sum_{j \in J \setminus J'} a_j \alpha_j \in \mathrm{wt}_{J \cup J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda \setminus \mathrm{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. As in the proof of Lemma 4.12, produce a monomial word $0 \neq x^-_{\alpha_{i_N}} \cdots x^-_{\alpha_{i_1}} v_\lambda \in \mathbb{V}^\lambda_\mu$. Then all indices are in $J \cup J'$; choose the smallest $k$ such that $i_k \in J \setminus J'$, and define $\mu_{k-1} := \lambda - \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \alpha_{i_l} \in \mathrm{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Now, $(\mu_{k-1}, \alpha_{i_k}) = (\lambda, \alpha_{i_k}) - \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} (\alpha_{i_l}, \alpha_{i_k})$, and each term in the sum is nonpositive since $i_l \in J', i_k \in J \setminus J'$. Since $\alpha_{i_k} \in \Delta_{J \setminus J'} \subset \Delta_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$, hence $(\mu_{k-1}, \alpha_{i_k}) \geq 0$.

We first claim that $(\mu_{k-1}, \alpha_{i_k}) > 0$. Suppose not. Then $(\lambda, \alpha_{i_k}) = (\alpha_{i_l}, \alpha_{i_k}) = 0 \ \forall l < k$, whence by the Serre relations, $[x^-_{\alpha_{i_l}}, x^-_{\alpha_{i_k}}] = 0 \ \forall l < k$. Hence by the previous paragraph,

$$0 \neq x^-_{\alpha_{i_k}} \cdots x^-_{\alpha_{i_1}} v_\lambda = x^-_{\alpha_{i_{k-1}}} \cdots x^-_{\alpha_{i_1}} x^-_{\alpha_{i_k}} v_\lambda.$$

In particular, $x^-_{\alpha_{i_k}} v_\lambda \neq 0$. But this contradicts Lemma 7.3 (with $J = I_0 = \{i_k\} \subset J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$), since $(\lambda, \alpha_{i_k}) = 0$. This proves the claim. Moreover, as shown above for $\mu_{k-1}$, $(\mu, \alpha_{i_k}) \geq 0 \ \forall \mu \in \mathrm{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Hence $(\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda}, \alpha_{i_k}) > 0$ from the above analysis. But this contradicts the $W_{J \cup J'}$-invariance of $\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda}$, since $\alpha_{i_k} \in \Delta_{J \setminus J'} \subset \Delta_{J \cup J'}$. This shows the result. $\square$

We are now ready to prove another main result of this paper.

*Proof of Theorem 4.* Clearly (2) implies (1). Now note by Proposition 7.2 that (3) is equivalent to:

(3′) $J \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda) = J' \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$ *and* $\mathrm{wt}_{J \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \mathrm{wt}_{J' \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$.

We next show that (1) $\implies$ (3′). Assuming (1), intersect both sets in (1) with the $W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$-stable set $\mathrm{wt}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, and using Equation (5.15), we obtain $w(S) = w'(S')$, where $S := \mathrm{wt}_{J \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ and $S' := \mathrm{wt}_{J' \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ for notational convenience. Summing, $w(\rho_S) = w'(\rho_{S'})$, whence by Lemma 5.3,

$$w \varpi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\rho_S/|S|) = \varpi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} w(\rho_S/|S|) = \varpi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} w'(\rho_{S'}/|S'|) = w' \varpi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\rho_{S'}/|S'|).$$

The above computations use that $|S| = |S'|$, and that $\frac{1}{|S|}\rho_S$ and $\frac{1}{|S'|}\rho_{S'}$ both lie in $\lambda + \mathbb{C}\Delta_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$. Now observe that $\varpi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\rho_S/|S|) = \frac{1}{|S|}\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_{J \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} M}$, where $M := L_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda))$ is a finite-dimensional $\mathfrak{g}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$-module. Similarly for $J'$ in place of $J$. Hence $w^{-1}w'(\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_{J' \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} M}) = \rho_{\mathrm{wt}_{J \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} M}$. Apply Proposition 5.10 (over $\mathfrak{g}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$); then $\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_{J \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} M}, \rho_{\mathrm{wt}_{J' \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} M} \in P^+_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$. Since every $W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$-orbit in $P^+_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$ contains at most one dominant element, hence $\rho_{\mathrm{wt}_{J \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} M} = \rho_{\mathrm{wt}_{J' \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} M}$. Tracing back, $\varpi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\rho_S/|S|) = \varpi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\rho_{S'}/|S'|)$. Since $\varpi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$ is injective, $\rho_S = \rho_{S'}$. Now by Proposition 5.10,

$$\mathrm{wt}_{J \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = (\mathrm{wt}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda)(\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \rho_S) = (\mathrm{wt}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda)(\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \rho_{S'}) = \mathrm{wt}_{J' \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda.$$

Next, suppose that $j \in J' \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$. Then by Proposition 5.4 and Theorem 1,

$$w^{-1}w'(\lambda) - \mathbb{Z}_+(w^{-1}w'\alpha_j) = w^{-1}w'(\lambda - \mathbb{Z}_+\alpha_j) \subset w^{-1}w'(\mathrm{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda) = \mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda \subset \mathrm{wt}_J M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)).$$

By [KhRi, Proposition 2.3], this implies that $w^{-1}w'(\alpha_j) \in \mathbb{Z}_+\Delta_J \cap \mathbb{Z}_+(\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi^+_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)})$. Therefore,

$$w^{-1}w'(\alpha_j) \in \Phi \cap (\mathbb{Z}_+\Delta_J) \cap (\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi^+_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}) = \Phi^+_J \setminus \Phi^+_{J \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \subset \Phi_{J \cup J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}.$$

This implies that $\alpha_j \in W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\Phi_{J \cup J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}) = \Phi_{J \cup J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$ for all $j \in J' \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$. We conclude that $J' \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda) \subset J \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$, and by symmetry, the reverse inclusion holds as well. Hence (1) $\implies$ (3′).

To show that (3′) $\implies$ (2), apply Equation (5.14) with

$$J_1 := I, \qquad J_2 := I \setminus (J \cup J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)) = I \setminus (J' \cup J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)), \qquad J_3 = J, J'.$$

Then (3′) implies that $\mathrm{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \mathrm{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, showing (2).

Next, we show that (3′) $\iff$ (4) (or more strongly, that the second parts of both assertions are equivalent). Equation (5.15), Proposition 7.2, and Lemma 7.4 show that if $\mathrm{wt}_{J_1} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \mathrm{wt}_{J_2} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ for some $J_1, J_2 \subset J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$, then $\mathrm{wt}_{J_1} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \mathrm{wt}_{J_1 \cup J_2} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \mathrm{wt}_{J_2} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \mathrm{wt}_{J_1 \cap J_2} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Now define $\mathcal{S}$ to be the set of all subsets $J_3 \subset J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$ such that $\operatorname{wt}_{J_3} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \operatorname{wt}_{J \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, and set $J_{\min} := \bigcap_{J_3 \in \mathcal{S}} J_3$, $J_{\max} := \bigcup_{J_3 \in \mathcal{S}} J_3$. Then $\operatorname{wt}_{J_{\min}} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \operatorname{wt}_{J \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \operatorname{wt}_{J_{\max}} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ by these same results, and $(3') \iff (4)$.

Finally, we show that the second parts of $(3')$ and $(5)$ are equivalent. To do so, it suffices (via the bijection $\varpi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$) to work inside the root system $\Phi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$ and with the highest weight $\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda)$. Also note that in Definition 5.5, $C(\lambda, J) = C(\pi_{J_0}(\lambda), J)$ for all $J \subset J_0 \subset I$. Thus, for the remainder of the proof we make the following substitutions:

$$I \rightsquigarrow J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda), \qquad J \rightsquigarrow J \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda), \qquad J' \rightsquigarrow J' \cap J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda), \qquad \lambda \rightsquigarrow \pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda), \qquad \mathfrak{g} \rightsquigarrow \mathfrak{g}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}.$$

In this setting, (the second parts of) $(3') \iff (5)$ translates to:

$$\operatorname{wt}_J L(\lambda) = \operatorname{wt}_{J'} L(\lambda) \iff C(\lambda, J) \cup C(\lambda, J') \subset J \cap J'.$$

To prove this equivalence, note that $\operatorname{wt}_J L(\lambda) = \operatorname{wt}_{J'} L(\lambda)$ if and only if their intersection, which by Equation (5.15) equals $\operatorname{wt}_{J \cap J'} L(\lambda)$, equals each of them. In turn, these two equalities are equivalent, by [KhRi, Proposition 5.1] and via the bijections $\varpi_J, \varpi_{J'}$, to saying respectively that

$$J \cap J' \supset C(\pi_J(\lambda), J) = C(\lambda, J), \qquad J \cap J' \supset C(\pi_{J'}(\lambda), J') = C(\lambda, J').$$

This concludes the proof. $\square$

**Remark 7.5.** If $\operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \operatorname{wt}_{J \cup J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, then obviously $\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda \subset \operatorname{wt}_{J'} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. However, the converse is not always true. For example, suppose $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_3$, $\lambda = m_1\omega_1 \in P^+$, and $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = L(\lambda)$ is simple. Then,

$$\operatorname{wt}_{\{2\}} L(m_1\omega_1) = \{m_1\omega_1\} \subsetneq \operatorname{wt}_{\{1\}} L(m_1\omega_1) \subsetneq \operatorname{wt}_{\{1,2\}} L(m_1\omega_1) = \operatorname{wt} L(m_1\omega_1).$$

## 8. Extending the Weyl polytope to (pure) highest weight modules

We now prove Theorems 2 and 3. The first step is to identify the "edges" of the polyhedron $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda))$ for simply-regular $\lambda$. We now carry this out in greater generality.

**Theorem 8.1.** *Suppose $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and $J' \subset J_\lambda$ such that $\lambda(h_j)$ is nonzero for all $j \in J'$. Then $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J')$ is $W_{J'}$-invariant, and has extremal rays $\{\lambda - \mathbb{R}_+\alpha_i \ : \ i \notin J'\}$ at the vertex $\lambda$.*

*Proof.* The proof is in steps. The result is trivial for $J' = I$ by standard results (see e.g. [Hu]), since in this case $\lambda \in P^+$ and $M(\lambda, I) = L(\lambda)$. Now note by [KhRi, Proposition 2.4] that

$$\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J') = \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt}_{J'} M(\lambda, J') - \mathbb{R}_+(\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi^+_{J'}).$$

Hence the extremal rays (i.e., unbounded edges) through $\lambda$ are contained in $\{\lambda - \mathbb{R}_+\mu \ : \ \mu \in \mathbb{R}_+(\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi^+_{J'})\}$. (Note that every extremal ray passes through a vertex.) The next step is to reduce this set of candidates to $\{\lambda - \mathbb{R}_+\mu : \mu \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi^+_{J'}\}$. But this is clear: if $\mu = \sum_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi^+_{J'}} r_\alpha \alpha$ with $r_\alpha \geq 0$, and $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$, then using that $J' \neq I$,

$$\lambda - r\mu = \lambda - \sum_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi^+_{J'}} r r_\alpha \alpha = \frac{1}{|\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi^+_{J'}|} \sum_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi^+_{J'}} \left(\lambda - r r_\alpha |\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi^+_{J'}| \cdot \alpha\right).$$

Now use this principle again: namely, that extremal rays in a polyhedron are weak $\mathbb{R}$-faces, so no point on such a ray lies in the convex hull of points not all on the ray. Thus, we show that the set of extremal rays through $\lambda$ is $\{\lambda - \mathbb{R}_+\alpha_i \ : \ i \notin J'\}$. None of these rays $\lambda - \mathbb{R}_+\alpha_i$ is in the convex hull of $\{\lambda - \mathbb{R}_+\alpha_{i'} \ : \ i' \in I \setminus \{i\}\}$. Hence it suffices to show that for all $\mu \in \Phi^+ \setminus (\Delta \cup \Phi^+_{J'})$ and $r > 0$, the vector $\lambda - r\mu$ is in the convex hull of points in $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J')$ that are not all in $\lambda - \mathbb{R}_+\mu$. Suppose $\mu \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi^+_{J'}$ is of the form

$$\mu = \sum_{j \in J'} c_j \alpha_j + \sum_{s=1}^k d_s \alpha_{i_s},$$

where $c_j, 0 < d_s \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ for some $k > 0$, and $i_s \notin J'$ for all $s$. Recall the assumption on $\lambda$, which implies that for all $j \in J'$, $s_j(\lambda) = \lambda - n_j\alpha_j$ for some $n_j > 0$. Finally, to study $\lambda - r\mu$, define the function $f \in \operatorname{Fin}(\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J'), \mathbb{R}_+)$ via:

$$D := 1 + r\sum_{j\in J'} \frac{c_j}{n_j}, \qquad f(\lambda - krd_s\alpha_{i_s}) := \frac{1}{kD}, \qquad f(\lambda - n_{j_0}\alpha_{j_0} - r\mu) := \frac{rc_{j_0}}{Dn_{j_0}}$$

for all $1 \leq s \leq k$ and $j_0 \in J'$, and $f$ is zero otherwise. (If $r \notin \mathbb{Z}_+$, this can be suitably modified to replace each point in $\operatorname{supp}(f)$ by its two "neighboring" points in the corresponding weight string through $\lambda$, such that the new function is supported only on $\operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J')$.) Note that $\lambda - \mathbb{R}\mu$ does not intersect $\lambda - n_{j_0}\alpha_{j_0} - \mathbb{R}\mu$. Straightforward computations now show that $\ell(f) = 1$ and $\vec{\ell}(f) = \lambda - r\mu$, so $\lambda - r\mu \in \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}}(\operatorname{supp}(f))$. Now if $\mu \neq \alpha_i$ for some $i \notin J'$, then either some $c_j > 0$ or $k > 1$. But then $\operatorname{supp}(f)$ is not contained in $\lambda - \mathbb{R}_+\mu$, so it cannot be an extremal ray. □

### 8.1. **Connections to Fernando's results and convex hulls of pure modules.**

We next discuss connections between our results and the work of Fernando [Fe], where he began the classification of irreducible $\mathfrak{h}$-weight $\mathfrak{g}$-modules. (This classification was completed by Mathieu in [Ma]; in his terminology, the simple highest weight modules $L(\lambda) = L_{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda)$ are "parabolically induced".)

The following result shows that for every highest weight module $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$, the subset $J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$ is uniquely determined in the spirit of [Fe] as follows. To state it, we need the following notation from [Fe].

**Definition 8.2.** $P \subset \Phi$ is *closed* if $\alpha + \beta \in P$ whenever $\alpha, \beta \in P$ and $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$. Next, given a $\mathfrak{g}$-module $M$, define $\mathfrak{g}[M] := \{X \in \mathfrak{g} \ : \ \mathbb{C}[X] \cdot m \subset U(\mathfrak{g})m \subset M \text{ is finite-dimensional for all } m \in M\}$.

**Proposition 8.3.** *Given $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, $\mathfrak{g}[\mathbb{V}^\lambda]$ equals the parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{p}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$. Thus, one recovers $J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$ from $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ via:*

$$J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda) \leftrightarrow \Delta_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} = (-\operatorname{wt} \mathfrak{g}[\mathbb{V}^\lambda]) \cap \Delta. \tag{8.4}$$

*Proof.* Apply [Fe, Lemma 4.6] and the remarks preceding it. Since $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is in the BGG Category $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathscr{M}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}) \subset \overline{\mathscr{M}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$, $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is $\alpha$-finite (i.e., $x_\alpha$ acts locally finitely on $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$) for all roots $\alpha \in \Phi^+$. By [Hu, §9.3, 9.4], $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is also $\alpha$-finite for all roots $\alpha \in \Phi^-_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$, whereas $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is not $\alpha$-finite for all $\alpha \in -\Delta_{I \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$ by Theorem 1. Hence by [Fe, Lemma 4.6], the set $F(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$ of roots $\alpha \in \Phi$ such that $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is $\alpha$-finite is a closed set containing $\Phi^+ \coprod \Phi^-_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$ and disjoint from $-\Delta_{I \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$. Now by Lemma 3 in [Bou, Chapter VI.1.7], $F(\mathbb{V}^\lambda) = \Phi^+ \coprod \Phi^-_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$, whence $\mathfrak{g}[\mathbb{V}^\lambda] = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^+ \oplus \mathfrak{n}^-_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} = \mathfrak{p}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$. Equation (8.4) is now clear; it also follows directly from (the proof of) Theorem 1. □

We now show that the convex hull of $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is a polyhedron for a large family of modules $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$.

*Proof of Theorem 2.* For convenience, we break up the proof into steps. We first show that the convex hull is a polyhedron; next, we compute the extremal rays if $\lambda$ is simply-regular; and finally, we compute the stabilizer in $W$ of the weights and of their hull.

**Step 1.** The first assertion (except for the stabilizer subgroup being $W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$) follows from Proposition 2.9 if $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = M(\lambda, J')$. This implies the result when $|J_\lambda \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)| \leq 1$, by Theorem 5.

Next suppose that $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is pure (see Definition 3.3). It now suffices to show that $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda))$. One inclusion follows from Proposition 5.4. Conversely, to show that $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)) \subset \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, observe by Theorem 1 that $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is $W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$-stable. Now the vertices of $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda))$ are $W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda)$, and

$$M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda \twoheadrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)})v_\lambda \cong L_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda) \cong U(\mathfrak{g}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)})m_\lambda.$$

(Here, $m_\lambda$ and $v_\lambda$ generate $M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda))$ and $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ respectively.) Thus, $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ also contains these vertices. Now recall from [KhRi, Proposition 2.3] that $\operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)) = \operatorname{wt}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda - \mathbb{Z}_+(\Phi^+ \setminus$

$\Phi^+_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$). We **claim** that for all vertices $\mu \in W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda)$ and all $\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi^+_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$, the set $(\mu - \mathbb{Z}_+\alpha) \cap \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is infinite. (This implies in particular that the set of weights along every extremal ray is infinite.) Now taking the convex hull (twice) shows the result.

It remains to show the claim. For this, apply [Fe, Proposition 4.17] to the pure module $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Note by purity and Proposition 8.3 that $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is $\alpha$-finite if $\alpha \in F := \Phi^+ \coprod \Phi^-_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$, and $\alpha$-free if $\alpha \in T := \Phi^- \setminus \Phi^-_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$. Following the proof of *loc. cit.* yields that $P = F \cup (T \cap (-T)) = F$, whence $\mathfrak{p}^\pm_{\mathbb{V}^\lambda} = \mathfrak{p}^\pm_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$. Moreover, the result asserts that the nilradical of $\mathfrak{p}^-_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$ is torsion-free on all of $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$. This implies that for all $\mu \in \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ and $\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi^+_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$, the set $(\mu - \mathbb{Z}_+\alpha) \cap \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is infinite.

**Step 2.** Suppose $\lambda$ is simply-regular. Then the first assertion can be rephrased via Theorem 8.1 to say that $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda))$. As shown for pure modules, $W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda) \subset \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. It thus suffices to show - by the $W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$-invariance of both convex hulls in $\mathfrak{h}^*$ - that all extremal rays of $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda))$ at the vertex $\lambda$ are also contained in $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. But by Theorem 8.1, the extremal rays at $\lambda$ are $\{\lambda - \mathbb{R}_+\alpha_i \ : \ i \notin J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)\}$, and these are indeed contained in $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ (by Theorem 1) since $\lambda - \mathbb{Z}_+\alpha_i \subset \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda \ \forall i \notin J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$. This shows that $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda))$, and hence is a polyhedron, with extremal rays at $\lambda$ as described.

**Step 3.** Having computed the convex hull, we next show that the stabilizer $W'$ of $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ equals $W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$. By Theorem 1, $W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \subset W'$. Conversely, if $w' \in W'$, then $w'\lambda$ is a vertex of the convex polyhedron $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda))$. Thus there exists $w \in W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$ such that $w'\lambda = w\lambda$. Now by [KhRi, Proposition 2.3], $w^{-1}w'$ sends the root string $\lambda - \mathbb{Z}_+\alpha \subset \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ to $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda))$ for all $\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi^+_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$. But then,

$$w^{-1}w'(\alpha) \in W(\Phi) \setminus (\Phi^- \coprod \Phi^+_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}) = \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi^+_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}, \qquad \forall \alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi^+_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}. \tag{8.5}$$

Let $w^{-1}w' = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_r}$ be a reduced expression in $W$. If $w' \notin W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$, choose the largest $t$ such that $i_t \notin J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$. Then by Corollary 2 to Proposition 17 in [Bou, Chapter VI.1.6], $\beta_t := s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_{t+1}}(\alpha_{i_t})$ is a positive root such that $w^{-1}w'(\beta_t) < 0$. By Equation (8.5), $\beta_t \in \Phi^+_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$. Since $i_u \in J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$ for $u > t$, hence $\alpha_{i_t} \in W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\Phi^+_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}) = \Phi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$. This implies that $i_t \in J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$, which is a contradiction. Thus no such $w' \in W' \setminus W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$ exists, showing that $W' = W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$.

Finally, Theorem 1 implies that $W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$ stabilizes $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Moreover, if $w \in W$ stabilizes $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, then it also stabilizes $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, whence $w \in W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$ from the above analysis. $\square$

**Remark 8.6.** We have thus provided three different proofs for Theorem 2 in the case when $\lambda$ is simply-regular and $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = L(\lambda)$ or $M(\lambda, J')$. One method of proof uses convexity theory as in Theorem 8.1; another uses $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-theory as in Theorem 5 together with results from [Hu]; and the third uses Proposition 8.3 and results from [Fe]. More precisely, note by the discussion following [Fe, Remark 2.9] that all parabolic Verma modules $M(\lambda, J')$ are pure (see Definition 3.3), as are all simple highest weight modules $L(\lambda)$. Now use the arguments for pure $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ in the proof of Theorem 2. Similarly, Theorem 2 was also shown in multiple ways for $L(\lambda), M(\lambda, J')$ with simply-regular $\lambda$.

## 8.2. **Relating maximizer subsets and (weak) faces.**

We now prove Theorem 3. It is clear that every maximizer subset of a polyhedron is a weak $\mathbb{A}$-face, hence is $(\{2\}, \{1, 2\})$-closed. To show that it must also contain a vertex requires additional work. Thus, we first generalize the main technical tool used in [KhRi], from subfields $\mathbb{F} \subset \mathbb{R}$ to arbitrary additive subgroups $\mathbb{A}$.

**Proposition 8.7.** *Fix* $0 \neq \mathbb{A} \subset (\mathbb{R}, +)$*. Suppose* $Y \subset X \subset \mathbb{Q}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$*, and* $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}}(X)$ *is a polyhedron. Then* $Y \subset X$ *is a weak* $\mathbb{A}$*-face if and only if* $Y = F \cap X$*, where* $F$ *is a face of* $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}}(X)$*.*

Thus, $Y$ is independent of $\mathbb{A}$, and weak $\mathbb{A}$-faces are a natural extension of the usual notion of a face. Note that [KhRi, Theorem 4.3] was stated for $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{F}$ (an arbitrary subfield of $\mathbb{R}$), but assumed more generally that $X \subset \mathbb{F}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. However, Proposition 8.7 is suitable for the setting of $X = \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ as in this paper, because by Lemma 4.9, one can replace $X$ by $\lambda - \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}_+\Delta \cong \mathbb{Z}_+^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n \cong \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{R}}^*$.

*Proof.* By [KhRi, Theorem 4.3], if $Y = F \cap X$, then $Y \subset X$ is a weak $\mathbb{R}$-face, and hence a weak $\mathbb{A}$-face from the definitions. Conversely, if $Y$ is a weak $\mathbb{A}$-face of $X$, then by Lemma 4.9 (dividing $a \cdot \mathbb{Z} \subset \mathbb{A}$ by $a$, for any $0 < a \in \mathbb{A}$), $Y \subset X$ is a weak $\mathbb{Z}$-face, hence a weak $\mathbb{Q}$-face by Lemma 2.19. Again by [KhRi, Theorem 4.3], $Y = F \cap X$ for some face $F$ of $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}}(X)$, as desired. □

*Proof of Theorem 3.* Theorem 2 easily implies that (1) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (2) using Proposition 8.7 and Lemma 2.19. (One needs to first translate $Y \subset \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ to $\lambda - Y \subset \lambda - \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ via Lemma 4.9.) That (3) $\Longrightarrow$ (1) follows by Theorem 4.4 and $W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$-invariance, since $w(\operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda) = (\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda)(w(\rho_{I \setminus J}))$. Conversely, if $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = M(\lambda, J')$, then (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (3) follows from [KhRi, Theorem 1] and Equation (5.15) with $J_1' = I$ and $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = M(\lambda, J')$. Using this fact, it follows that (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (3) if $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is pure or $|J_\lambda \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)| \leq 1$, since it was shown in the proof of Theorem 2 that $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda))$ in both of these cases.

It remains to prove that (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (4) $\Longrightarrow$ (3) when $\lambda$ is simply-regular and $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is any highest weight module. Note that (4) simply says that $Y$ contains a point in $\operatorname{wt}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ and is $(\{2\}, \{1,2\})$-closed in $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Now (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (4) follows from Theorem 4.4, since any maximizer subset necessarily contains a vertex (because the polyhedron $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ has a vertex $\lambda$ by Theorem 2), and all vertices are indeed in $\operatorname{wt}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Finally, suppose (4) holds for $Y$. Then $Y \cap \operatorname{wt}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is $(\{2\}, \{1,2\})$-closed in $X_1 := \operatorname{wt}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ by Lemma 4.9. It follows by Lemma 5.3 that

$$\varpi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(Y) \cap \operatorname{wt} L_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda)) = \varpi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(Y \cap \operatorname{wt}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda) \subset \operatorname{wt} L_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda))$$

is $(\{2\}, \{1,2\})$-closed. Hence by Lemma 4.16 applied to $\mathfrak{g}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$, $\varpi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(Y \cap \operatorname{wt}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda)$ contains a vertex of the Weyl polytope of $\pi_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}(\lambda)$. Again via Lemma 5.3, $Y \cap \operatorname{wt}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ contains a vertex $w\lambda$ for some $w \in W_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$. Thus $w^{-1}(Y)$ is $(\{2\}, \{1,2\})$-closed in $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ and contains $\lambda$; moreover, $\lambda - \Delta \subset \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ since $\lambda$ is simply-regular. Hence $w^{-1}(Y) = \operatorname{wt}_J \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ for some (unique) subset $J \subset I$, by Theorem 4.4. This shows (3). □

**Remark 8.8.** Note that if $\lambda$ is simply-regular, and either $|J_\lambda \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)| \leq 1$ or $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = M(\lambda, J')$, then we do not need to assume the condition $Y \cap \operatorname{wt}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} \mathbb{V}^\lambda \neq \emptyset$ in (4) in Theorem 3. Indeed, use Theorem 5 and assume $Y \subset \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda))$ is $(\{2\}, \{1,2\})$-closed and nonempty. By [KhRi], suppose $\mu \in \operatorname{wt}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda))$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_+(\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi^+_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)})$ such that $\mu - \beta \in Y$. Then $(\mu - \beta) + (\mu - \beta) = \mu + (\mu - 2\beta)$. Hence $\mu, \mu - 2\beta \in Y$, so $Y \cap \operatorname{wt}_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)} M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)) \neq \emptyset$.

## 9. Application 2: Largest and smallest modules with specified hull or stabilizer

We now discuss an application which is related to Theorem 1. Note that the set of highest weight modules is naturally equipped with a partial order under surjection, and it has unique maximal and minimal elements $M(\lambda)$ and $L(\lambda)$ respectively. We now show that this ordering can be refined in terms of the stabilizer subgroup of the weights, or equivalently, their convex hull. For instance if $\lambda + \rho_I \in P^+$, then by [Hu, Proposition 4.3], $M(w \cdot \lambda) \subset M(\lambda)\ \forall w \in W$, and hence

$$w_\circ \cdot \lambda = w_\circ(\lambda) - 2\rho_I \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda) = \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt}(M(\lambda)/M(w_\circ \cdot \lambda)) = \lambda - \mathbb{R}_+\Delta.$$

In fact, there is a unique "smallest" highest weight module whose weights have this same convex hull - equivalently, whose set of weights has trivial stabilizer subgroup in $W$. We now prove our last main result, which generalizes this fact.

*Proof of Theorem 6.* Clearly, (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (2) $\Longrightarrow$ (3) by Theorem 2. If (3) holds, define $\mu_j := \lambda - (\lambda(h_j) + 1)\alpha_j$ for all $j$. Then $\mu_j = s_j(\lambda + \alpha_j)$, so $\mu_j \notin \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ for $j \in J'$. Now if $m_\lambda, v_\lambda$ span $M(\lambda)_\lambda$ and $\mathbb{V}^\lambda_\lambda$ respectively, then $M(\lambda)_{\mu_j} = \mathbb{C} \cdot (x^-_{\alpha_j})^{\lambda(h_j)+1} m_\lambda$ (using the Kostant partition function), whence $(x_{\alpha_j}^-)^{\lambda(h_j)+1} v_\lambda = 0 \ \forall j \in J'$. Thus $M(\lambda, J') \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, which also implies that $M_{\max}(\lambda, J') = M(\lambda, J')$.

We show the rest of the implication (3) $\implies$ (4) case-by-case. First if $J' = J_\lambda$, then $M_{\min}(\lambda, J_\lambda) := L(\lambda)$ works by Theorem 2. We now show that if $\lambda$ is simply-regular or $J' = \emptyset$, then there exists $M_{\min}(\lambda, J')$ as in (4), and moreover, $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M_{\min}(\lambda, J') = \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J')$. This would imply that (4) $\implies$ (1) by the "intermediate value property" of convex hulls.

Define $\mathbb{M}(\lambda, J')$ to be the set of all nonzero $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ such that $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is invariant under $W_{J'}$ but not a larger parabolic subgroup of $W$. Given $\mathbb{V}^\lambda \in \mathbb{M}(\lambda, J')$, let $K_{\mathbb{V}^\lambda}$ denote the kernel of the surjection : $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Now given such a $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ and $i \in I$, suppose $(x_{\alpha_i}^-)^n m_\lambda \in K_{\mathbb{V}^\lambda}$ for some $n \geq 0$. If $i \in J_\lambda$ and $n \leq \lambda(h_i)$ or $i \notin J_\lambda$ then $m_\lambda \in K_{\mathbb{V}^\lambda}$ by $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-theory, which is false since $\mathbb{V}^\lambda \neq 0$. Otherwise if $i \in J_\lambda$ and $n > \lambda(h_i)$, then $(x_{\alpha_i}^-)^{\lambda(h_i)+1} m_\lambda \in K_{\mathbb{V}^\lambda}$ by $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-theory, whence $M(\lambda, J' \cup \{i\}) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. By [Hu, §9.3, 9.4], $\mathbb{V}^\lambda \in \mathbb{M}(\lambda, J')$ is stable under $W_{J' \cup \{i\}}$, so $i \in J'$.

We conclude that for all $\mathbb{V}^\lambda \in \mathbb{M}(\lambda, J')$, $(x_{\alpha_i}^-)^n m_\lambda \notin K_{\mathbb{V}^\lambda}$ for all $n \geq 0$ and $i \notin J'$. Since $K_{\mathbb{V}^\lambda} \subset M(\lambda)$ is a weight module and since

$$\dim (K_{\mathbb{V}^\lambda})_{\lambda - n\alpha_i} \leq \dim M(\lambda)_{\lambda - n\alpha_i} = 1 \qquad \forall i \in I, n \in \mathbb{Z}_+,$$

hence $(K_{\mathbb{V}^\lambda})_{\lambda - n\alpha_i} = 0 \ \forall i \notin J', n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Define $K(\lambda, J') := \sum_{\mathbb{V}^\lambda \in \mathbb{M}(\lambda, J')} K_{\mathbb{V}^\lambda}$; then

$$\lambda - \mathbb{Z}_+ \alpha_i \subset \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J')/K(\lambda, J') \qquad \forall \lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*, \ J' \subset J_\lambda, \ i \notin J'. \tag{9.1}$$

Now suppose (as per the assumptions of the theorem) that $\lambda$ is simply-regular or $J' = \emptyset$, and $\mathbb{V}^\lambda \in \mathbb{M}(\lambda, J')$. Define $M_{\min}(\lambda, J') := M(\lambda, J')/K(\lambda, J')$; then $M_{\max}(\lambda, J'), M_{\min}(\lambda, J') \in \mathbb{M}(\lambda, J')$ by Equation (9.1) and [Hu, §9.3,9.4]. Moreover, it is clear that $\mathbb{V}^\lambda \twoheadrightarrow M_{\min}(\lambda, J')$ for all $\mathbb{V}^\lambda \in \mathbb{M}(\lambda, J')$. Now note by Theorem 2 that the extremal rays of $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} M(\lambda, J')$ at $\lambda$ are $\lambda - \mathbb{R}_+ \Delta_{I \setminus J'}$. Hence $\operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M_{\max}(\lambda, J') = \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{wt} M_{\min}(\lambda, J')$. This also shows that (4) $\implies$ (1). (Moreover, if there is an "overlap" in the sense that $\lambda$ is simply-regular and $J' = J_\lambda$, then $L(\lambda) \in \mathbb{M}(\lambda, J')$, whence $L(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow M_{\min}(\lambda, J') \twoheadrightarrow L(\lambda)$. Thus, $M_{\min}(\lambda, J')$ is indeed well-defined.) ☐

**Remark 9.2.** Note that if $J' \subset J_\lambda$ and $|J_\lambda \setminus J'| \leq 1$, then Theorem 5 implies that $\operatorname{wt} : \mathbb{M}(\lambda, J') \to (\{0,1\}^{\lambda - \mathbb{Z}_+ \Delta})^{W_{J'}}$ is constant (where $\mathbb{M}(\lambda, J')$ was defined in the proof of Theorem 6).

## Appendix A. Paths between comparable weights in highest weight modules

In this section, we explain how a well-known result on root systems is a special case of a phenomenon that occurs in all highest weight modules. The results in this appendix are not used in the rest of this paper, though we indicate how they may be used in proving Proposition 8.3.

We begin by recalling Proposition 19 in [Bou, Chapter VI.1.6]: every positive root $\mu' \in \Phi^+$ can be written as a sum $\mu' = \alpha_{i_1} + \cdots + \alpha_{i_k}$ of simple roots such that each partial sum $\alpha_{i_1} + \cdots + \alpha_{i_l}$ is a positive root for each $1 \leq l \leq k$. We now claim a stronger condition: namely, that it is possible to rearrange these (possibly repeated) simple roots in such a way that any of them occurs as $\alpha_{i_1}$. Such a result would in fact imply the fact from [Bou] that was used to show Proposition 8.3 - and by extension, Theorem 2 and hence Theorem 3 as well, for all pure modules $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ (e.g., $L(\lambda)$).

**Proposition A.1.** *Recall the usual partial order on $\mathfrak{h}^*$: $\mu \leq \mu'$ if $\mu' - \mu \in Q^+ = \mathbb{Z}_+ \Delta$. Suppose $\mu \leq \mu' \in \Phi^+$ (and $\mu$ is a simple root). Then there exists a sequence $i_1, \dots, i_N \in I$ such that for all $1 \leq l \leq N$, $\mu_l := \mu + \sum_{j=1}^l \alpha_{i_j} \in \Phi^+$ and $\mu_N = \mu'$.*

More generally, one can ask the same question for every highest-weight module $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ for $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ (e.g., in every finite-dimensional simple module):

**Question A.2.** Fix $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, and suppose $\mu \leq \mu' \in \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Can we find a sequence of weights $\mu_j \in \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ such that each $\mu_j - \mu_{j+1}$ is a simple root, and $\mu' = \mu_0 > \mu_1 > \cdots > \mu_N = \mu$?

This question is very general; one can ask it in special cases such as Verma modules or finite-dimensional modules $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = L(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in P^+$. (A special case of this is the adjoint representation as in Proposition A.1.) Although this result is quite natural to expect, we are not aware of a reference in the literature where it is proved. S. Kumar has communicated a proof to us in the finite-dimensional case, which we now reproduce - and extend to all $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ using Theorem 1. We thus answer this question positively in a large number of cases, which include all of the above examples.

**Theorem A.3.** *Suppose* $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ *and* $M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. *Also assume that in the usual partial order on* $\mathfrak{h}^*$, $\lambda \geq \mu' \geq \mu \in \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$, *and that one of the following occurs:*

1. *One of these two inequalities is an equality;*
2. $\mu' - \mu \in \Delta \cup \mathbb{Z}_+ \Delta_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$*;*
3. $|J_\lambda \setminus J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)| \leq 1$ *(e.g.,* $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = L(\lambda)$ *is simple); or*
4. $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = M(\lambda, J')$ *is a parabolic Verma module, for some* $J' \subset J_\lambda$.

*Then there exists a sequence of weights* $\mu_j \in \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ *such that*

$$\mu' = \mu_0 > \mu_1 > \cdots > \mu_N = \mu, \qquad \mu_j - \mu_{j+1} \in \Delta \ \forall j. \tag{A.4}$$

It is also easy to check that the result holds in other cases:

- When $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_2$ and $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is arbitrary (since every $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is a parabolic Verma module).
- If $\lambda, \mu' \in P^+$ and $\mu \in \operatorname{conv}_{\mathbb{R}} W(\lambda)$. In this case, use Theorem 2.3 to show that $\mu, \mu' \in \operatorname{wt} L(\lambda) \subset \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Now use Theorem A.3 for $L(\lambda) = M(\lambda, I)$.

*Proof.* (The meat of this result is the second part, which was originally shown by S. Kumar for finite-dimensional $\mathbb{V}^\lambda$, in the same manner as below.) Define any pair $(\mu, \mu')$ that satisfies Equation (A.4) to be *admissible*. If (1) holds or $\mu' - \mu \in \Delta$, then the result follows from Lemma 4.12 (or is obvious). Now suppose (2) holds and $\mu \leq \mu' \in \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is an inadmissible pair such that $\mu' - \mu \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \Delta_{J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)}$; we will then arrive at a contradiction. Choose inadmissible $\mu \leq \mu' \in \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ such that $2 \leq \operatorname{ht}(\mu' - \mu)$ is minimal. Further refine this choice such that $1 \leq \operatorname{ht}(\lambda - \mu')$ is minimal. Now define

$$J := \operatorname{supp}(\mu' - \mu) = \{i \in I : (\mu' - \mu, \omega_i) \neq 0\}.$$

Then $J \subset J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda)$ by assumption, so by Theorem 1, $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is $w_\circ^J$-stable, where $w_\circ^J \in W_J$ is the longest element. Choose a nonzero vector $v_{\mu'} \in \mathbb{V}^\lambda_{\mu'}$. If $\mathfrak{n}_J^- v_{\mu'} \neq 0$, then there exists $j \in J$ such that $\mu' - \alpha_j \in \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. Since $\mu' - \alpha_j \geq \mu$, the pair $(\mu, \mu' - \alpha_j)$ is admissible, whence so is $(\mu, \mu')$, a contradiction. Hence $\mathfrak{n}_J^- v_{\mu'} = 0$, whence $v_{\mu'}$ generates a lowest weight $\mathfrak{g}_J$-submodule. Since $\mathbb{V}^\lambda \in \mathcal{O}$, $U(\mathfrak{g}_J) v_{\mu'}$ is a finite-dimensional lowest weight $\mathfrak{g}_J$-module, whence it is in fact simple and isomorphic to $L_J(w_\circ^J \mu')$. Moreover, $-\mu'(h_j) \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ for all $j \in J$ and hence,

$$\mu' \leq w_\circ^J \mu' < w_\circ^J \mu \leq \lambda, \qquad \operatorname{ht}(w_\circ^J \mu - w_\circ^J \mu') = \operatorname{ht}(\mu' - \mu), \qquad \operatorname{ht}(\lambda - w_\circ^J \mu) < \operatorname{ht}(\lambda - \mu'). \tag{A.5}$$

Hence the pair $(w_\circ^J \mu', w_\circ^J \mu)$ is admissible, whence there exists a chain of weights as asserted. As mentioned earlier in this proof, $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$ is $w_\circ^J$-stable, so applying $w_\circ^J$ to this chain of weights for $(w_\circ^J \mu', w_\circ^J \mu)$ yields the desired chain from $\mu'$ to $\mu$ in $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda$. This is a contradiction, and we are done if (2) holds.

Next if (3) holds, then $\operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda = \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J(\mathbb{V}^\lambda))$ by Theorem 5, so the result follows from (4). Finally, if $\mathbb{V}^\lambda = M(\lambda, J')$ for $J' \subset J_\lambda$, then suppose $\mu = \mu' - \sum_{i \in I} n_i \alpha_i$ for some choice of integers $n_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. By [KhRi, Proposition 2.3], $\operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J')$ is stable under subtracting $\alpha_i$ for $i \notin J'$, so we obtain a chain in $\operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J')$ from $\mu'$ to $\mu'' := \mu' - \sum_{i \notin J'} n_i \alpha_i$. Now apply the previous part to

$$\mathbb{V}^\lambda = M(\lambda, J'), \qquad \mu' \rightsquigarrow \mu'', \qquad \mu \leq \mu'' \in \operatorname{wt} \mathbb{V}^\lambda.$$

This yields the desired chain in $\operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J')$ from $\mu''$ to $\mu$. □

**Acknowledgments.** I would like to thank Michel Brion, Daniel Bump, Vyjayanthi Chari, James Humphreys, and Shrawan Kumar for their stimulating conversations, suggestions, and references, which were very beneficial at different stages of this project.

## References

[And] J.E. Anderson, *A polytope calculus for semisimple groups*, Duke Math. Journal **116** no. 3 (2003), 567–588.

[ABH] F. Ardila, M. Beck, S. Hosten, J. Pfeifle, and K. Seashore, *Root polytopes and growth series of root lattices*, SIAM Journal of Discrete Mathematics **25** (2011), 360–378.

[BCF] A. Bianchi, V. Chari, G. Fourier, A. Moura, *On multigraded generalizations of Kirillov-Reshetikhin modules*, to appear in Algebras and Representation Theory; `math.RT/1208.3236`.

[Bou] N. Bourbaki, *Lie Groups and Lie Algebras, Chapters 4–6 (Elements of Mathematics)*, Springer, Berlin-New York, 2002.

[CM] P. Cellini and M. Marietti, *Root polytopes and Borel subalgebras*, preprint, `math.CO/1203.0756`.

[CP] P. Cellini and P. Papi, *Abelian ideals of Borel subalgebras and affine Weyl groups*, Advances in Mathematics **187** (2004), 320–361.

[CDR] V. Chari, R.J. Dolbin, and T. Ridenour, *Ideals in parabolic subalgebras of simple Lie algebras*, Contemporary Mathematics **490** (2009), 47–60.

[CG1] V. Chari and J. Greenstein, *A family of Koszul algebras arising from finite-dimensional representations of simple Lie algebras*, Advances in Mathematics **220** no. 4 (2009), 1193–1221.

[CG2] V. Chari and J. Greenstein, *Minimal affinizations as projective objects*, Journal of Geometry and Physics **61** no. 3 (2011), 594–609.

[CKR] V. Chari, A. Khare, and T. Ridenour, *Faces of polytopes and Koszul algebras*, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra **216** no. 7 (2012), 1611–1625.

[Chi] R. Chirivì, *Root polytope and partitions*, preprint, `math.CO/1210.8379`.

[Fe] S.L. Fernando, *Lie algebra modules with finite-dimensional weight spaces, I*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **322** no. 2 (1990), 757–781.

[Ha] B.C. Hall, *Lie groups, Lie algebras, and representations: an elementary introduction*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, no. **222**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 2004.

[HK] J. Hong and S.-J. Kang, *Introduction to quantum groups and crystal bases*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics **42**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002.

[Hu] J.E. Humphreys, *Representations of semisimple Lie algebras in the BGG Category $\mathcal{O}$*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics **94**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2008.

[Ka] J. Kamnitzer, *Mirković-Vilonen cycles and polytopes*, Annals of Mathematics **171** no. 1 (2010), 245–294.

[KhRi] A. Khare and T. Ridenour, *Faces of weight polytopes and a generalization of a theorem of Vinberg*, Algebras and Representation Theory **15** no. 3 (2012), 593–611.

[KiRe] A.N. Kirillov and N.Y. Reshetikhin, *Representations of Yangians and multiplicities of occurrence of the irreducible components of the tensor product of representations of simple Lie algebras*, Journal of Mathematical Sciences **52** no. 3 (1990), 3156–3164.

[KLV] D. Kazhdan, M. Larsen, and Y. Varshavsky, *The Tannakian Formalism and the Langlands Conjectures*, preprint, `math.NT/1006.3864`.

[Ko1] B. Kostant, *Eigenvalues of a Laplacian and commutative Lie subalgebras*, Topology **3** suppl. 2 (1965), 147–159.

[Ko2] B. Kostant, *The set of Abelian ideals of a Borel subalgebra, Cartan decompositions, and discrete series representations*, International Mathematics Research Notices **5** (1998), 225–252.

[Ma] O. Mathieu, *Classification of irreducible weight modules*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **50** no. 2 (2000), 537–592.

[Me] K. Mészáros, *Root polytopes, triangulations, and the subdivision algebra, II*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **363** no. 11 (2011), 6111–6141.

[Pa] D. Panyushev, *Abelian ideals of a Borel subalgebra and long positive roots*, International Mathematics Research Notices **35** (2003), 1889–1913.

[PR] D. Panyushev and G. Röhrle, *Spherical orbits and abelian ideals*, Advances in Mathematics **159** (2001), 229–246.

[Su] R. Suter, *Abelian ideals in a Borel subalgebras of a complex simple Lie algebra*, Inventiones Mathematicae **156** (2004), 175–221.

[Vi] E.B. Vinberg, *On certain commutative subalgebras of a universal enveloping algebra*, Math. USSR Izv. **36** no. 1 (1991), 1–22.

*E-mail address*, A. Khare: `khare@stanford.edu`

Department of Mathematics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA - 94305